JAN 13 1986

GP 3.30:985/2/v.3

ORIGINAL

COMPLETED
133

MEETING OF THE
DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL
TO THE PUBLIC PRINTER

HASSE HALL
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C.

Friday, October 18, 1985
Volume III

The meeting of the Council was called to order by the Chairman.

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.
1511 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 808
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-2121

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Jennie B. Cross, Chairman

Diane H. Smith, Chair-elect

Marian Carroll, Secretary

Mildred Mason
Barratt Wilkins
Sandra McAninch (absent)
Susan E. Tulis
James R. Veatch, Jr.
Robert A. Walter
Kathleen Eisenbeis
Clyde W. Hordusky
Rosamond Jacob
Margaret M. Prudden
Hans Raum
Bruce Morton

INDEX

	Page
Welcome and Remarks by Jennie Cross	4
Motion to Amend By-Laws	5
Statement of Frederic R. Broome	20
Recommendations	53

PROCEEDINGS

MS. CROSS: I call the meeting of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer to order.

Yesterday, we had a very full agenda. We did have a lot of interesting presentations. It, unfortunately, did not leave us adequate time to fully discuss some matters of concern which some of you had wished to bring to the floor. If you would get those items of concern to us in the next few weeks, we will do everything we can to get them on the Spring Agenda so they can get attention.

We will try to group multiple requests. We got several letters this time and when Diane was chairing the Open Forum on Wednesday, she was trying to have categories of concerns so we were a little better organized in our approach.

We welcome your input and please get that information to us as soon as possible.

One matter of business that the Council needs to deal with is amending our by-laws. Our former secretary, Richard Nicoles, brought up an interesting situation in that the Council, according to the By-Laws, is required to have an annual report each year. We present the Annual Report to the Public Printer.

In essence, there had not been an annual report for a number of years. I think 1978 or '79 was the last published Annual Report. Because we record, we have a transcript of all of the sessions of the Council, it was deemed somewhat redundant to then turn around and write an annual report.

We have been talking about this, trying to decide what we should do, whether we should go back and get every previous Council to come up with an annual report, and we continue that. Or, whether in the name of efficiency, we dispense with it. We have finally decided that it is best if we just dispense with it.

According to our By-Laws, at a duly constituted meeting as this, we are permitted to amend our By-Laws. So, I will entertain a motion from council to do that.

MOTION

MR. MORTON: I would like to move that Article VII of the Depository Library Council By-Laws be amended so that the words "Section 1" are removed and that what is now Section 1 merely reads, "Reports of meetings, the Secretary will prepare a report of each meeting for the signature of the Chairman and the Public Printer, a synopsis of the action taken by the Council at the meeting will be included."

The following Section 2, which basically deals with annual reports, will be entirely deleted.

MS. CROSS: Is there a second?

MR. WALTER: I second.

MS. CROSS: Bob Walter, second.

It has been moved and seconded that Article VII of the Depository Library Council By-laws be amended so that Section 1 is omitted having to do with reports, that becomes the body of Article VII and that Section 2 is completely omitted. Is there discussion?

DR. VEATCH: The Annual Reports go back to further than when I was involved with depository library matters at all or government documents at all. I would like to hear from some other people who remember the annual report to tell us a little bit about what it was. Are we going to be losing anything by not having an Annual Report? What was included? Does what is being proposed actually meet the needs? Does anyone remember the Annual Report?

MS. CROSS: Does anyone on council wish to reply?

MS. HODUSKI: I don't think I am the only one with a memory. I see some people here from Council. I find it useful on the Joint Committee on Printing staff as a summary. Many people have not spent the time to wade through those transcripts. This pulls together your actions that do not necessarily appear in Administrative Notes or even those summaries.

It is something, a publication, that can be sent out to all the libraries and easily available to people of what actions you have taken to the past. I think that we, on the early Councils, considered it to be a very valuable tool. We have used it since and many of the previous Council people -- I know that Fran Buckley told me the other day that someone called him and asked him about a previous thing and he used the Annual Report because he was not about to wade through those transcripts to find out what the Councils had done.

I would say that the three previous chairs of Council, who are responsible for the reports, had indicated to me at Albuquerque that they were working on them, that they were doing them. So, I would suggest that you ask those three previous chairs to get in their annual reports. I would be opposed to eliminating the Annual Report just because it is a little bit additional work for the Council. It makes you pull together what you have done and think through what you have done and maybe what you wanted to do and did not do.

DR. VEATCH: Personally, the transcript, while I am very happy to have it and do read through it, once I have read through it, it is very difficult for me to use afterwards. It is not a good reference tool to check on things we said or did. For that reason, I plan to oppose this motion.

MS. CARROLL: I have a question. If an index were provided to the transcripts, would that in any way replace it? That would provide ease of access to the contents of the transcript.

MS. CROSS: I am sure it would be helpful. I am not quite sure who would do the index.

MS. CARROLL: I thought perhaps that could be in lieu of the other and would be easier.

MS. CROSS: I was not aware that former chairs were working on annual reports. Are there some former chairs in the audience who wish to indicate that they are doing that?

I see one.

MS. PETERSON: Sandy Peterson. I can't say that I am, because mine was the most recent history, it would certainly be the easiest to write.

The problem seemed to be that there was -- there was some discussion as to whose responsibility it was, whether it was the Secretary's or the Chair's. In earlier councils there are disputes about that.

I think you would find that you would end up with some gaps because no one is willing to do it.

MS. CROSS: Don, I think you have had some discussion with the Public Printer about this. Could you fill in a little bit there about the feelings from his Office and/or your Office?

MR. FOSSEDAL: As you can imagine, I have a lot of discussions with the Public Printer.

It is fine with him if you do away with the Annual Report. Thank goodness it is not one of our issues. It is council's. You do whatever you think is best. I am willing to live with the transcript, even an indexed transcript. We have a lot of librarians in this organization. I imagine they could do a good job indexing it if they are so inclined.

If, on the other hand, it is the sense of the library community that that this is not a vital tool, if you need to refer to it a lot in Detroit, places like that, then maybe you do need the actual Annual Report.

Personally, I read the transcript of the last meeting twice. It took me five hours the first time and three hours the second time. So, in short I am willing and the

Public Printer is willing give up the Annual Report if Council feels it is necessary.

I do not want to insert myself into your decisions on your By-Laws.

MS. CROSS: I think I am the person who called Fran and asked for some past history. He did send me a copy of the Annual report. It is nice. It is helpful. It is quite a lot of work to put one of those together, I am sure.

MS. AXTMANN: Margie Axtmann, Cornell Law Library.

As a member of the Depository Library community, I would be opposed to this motion. I would hope that the Council's work for the year does not center solely on the two meetings that it holds and that there are other issues and events to report in an annual report that the rest of the library community would not be privy to without publication of an annual report.

I don't think the fact that it is a lot of work to do is grounds for eliminating it.

MS. CROSS: No, that should not be the only reason.

MS. EISENBEIS: I am against it because I don't believe the transcript substitutes. I read the transcript in paper for the first time and can appreciate the fact that I have always had it in microfiche and would not bother to go back and look at it. It is a bear. I don't think the additional work should be the reason for not doing it.

MS. MILLS: Lois Mills, Western Illinois University.

I would have to agree with the previous four speakers, I think. I don't think that because it is a little work that is a reason to stop doing something. That has been the trend of the Council in the last couple of years, "It is too much work so we aren't going to do it."

It would be a lot more work, to my knowledge, to make an index to the transcripts than it would to compile an annual report. An annual report should be short enough and succinct enough so that people can read it and get an idea, an accurate idea, of the business that went on. If it is issued in microfiche, to be able to afford to make a blow-back copy of it for their use.

The transcript is useful only as a back-up history. I don't think it would substitute at all for an Annual Report.

DR. VEATCH: I am also concerned about the availability of past reports. Somebody got me a copy of the By-Laws that had been in an earlier Annual report. I think that somebody said those were reproduced occasionally in those. How easy is it for a new depository to get a copy of the By-Laws of the Depository Library Council? Where are those? Does anybody know? Do new librarians know how to do that?

MS. CROSS: I think they could ask any Council member or they could ask GPO for a copy if they wished. They are certainly available.

MS. EISENBEIS: Jim, they are in a book called From Press to People by Yuri Nakata, in the appendix.

A PARTICIPANT: That is out-of-print.

DR. VEATCH: That is out-of-print, did somebody say?

MS. EISENBEIS: That is the only copy I have ever seen. As a member of the Council, I expected to be given a copy.

DR. VEATCH: The proposed revision of these By-Laws, that we are considering right now, the only official appearance of that would be imbedded in the transcript of this meeting; is that correct?

MS. CROSS: I think if we amended the By-Laws, Jim, that a new issue of them indicating the change would certainly be issued. I cannot imagine that the transcript would be the only record of it.

A PARTICIPANT: Tom Lindsay, Texas Tech University.

As I understand it, the issue is -- someone suggested indexing the transcript, is that not done now?

I don't know how many pages this will turn out to be in transcript, but I indexed a book this summer and my estimate is you can do about six to eight pages of transcript indexing an hour, depending on how detailed you wanted your index to be.

It may be much easier to do an annual report and then index the annual report, if it is very long.

MS. CROSS: All right.

MR. MORTON: I have two comments and a friendly amendment to offer.

One is what will remain under the Article VII, Reports would read now, "Reports of meetings: the Secretary will prepare a report of each meeting for the signature of the Chairman and the Public Printer, a synopsis of the action taken by the Council will be included."

This would remain in the By-Laws, so your concern about getting a synoptic version of what happens at the meetings would still be met.

I would offer a friendly amendment that it would be reading, "Reports of meetings and other activities", to address the concern that was raised that may well be active other than at the two meetings that are regularly convened.

The other point is an observation that, I think for six years now we have not had an Annual Report. Now, this vital, essential information has never been -- the lack thereof, has never been brought to the attention of the Council. The only reason it is being raised by the Council now is because council is concerned with adherence to the By-Laws.

My question is: Why are all of you who are saying it is so essential, not missed it for the last six years?

MR. WILKINS: That was just ditto of what I wanted to say. I am speaking for the motion.

MS. HODUSKI: Well, I will tell you what I have on my shelves, besides the transcripts I have the binders. This time I did not get a binder, but I have the binders every time with the list of the membership and with the actions that you have taken. It is taking up a lot of space.

The annual report, which would be a cumulative picture of the members of the Council and the actions and who was on the Council the year that certain decisions were made, I think that, historically speaking, it is important. Now, if you want to take the Annual Report and put the minutes in as part of it, rather than rewriting, as some people have done, that is one way of issuing an annual report: pulling the minutes together for the two meetings of that year, or all the past meetings and pulling them all together in one document.

You know, I think maybe you are thinking of the work as having to rewrite or something, but there is such a simple thing as pulling together who the members of the Council were.

Right now I defy most people to know who all they were, unless they do a lot of research, and they have kept every sheet. I happen to have you all on my computer, and I have had to go back, though, and do a lot of research to figure out which year which people served, and to how to keep different people on there. That is one of the values also: historical record.

Maybe some day somebody might want to read, really read about what you all have done.

Diane?

MS. SMITH: I have before me the First Report to the Public Printer of the Depository Library Council which covers the years 1972 through 1976, which is a four-year time span.

What we are discussing is the report from the Council itself for that four years. It composes ten pages for four years. That is 2.5 pages per year.

I really find it hard to believe that there is that much information in here that is not available in the synopsis that is presently provided by the Secretary. The membership people who are on this Committee, on this Council, composes for those four years, three pages. We have now been talking for twenty-five minutes about 2.5 pages a year. Do you really need that, is the question.

MS. CROSS: Council, do you want to call the question?

As we began last Spring, we polled the Council membership by name. I don't have an alphabetical list. I meant to prepare one. If it is all right, I will just start and go down the table this way, unless that is -- Parliamentarian, is that all right?

We did not get a second to Bruce's friendly amendment.

MR. WALTER: That was a friendly amendment, I believe, and as the seconder I accept the amendment.

MS. CROSS: Okay. What we are doing, in Article

Seven of the Bylaws of the Depository Library Council, the motion is to take out words, Section 1, which says, "reports;" put that paragraph up in Article Seven, and Bruce's friendly amendment that says it will include reports of meetings and other activities of Council. Then completely eliminate Section 2, which has to deal with, "The Council will provide an annual report to the Public Printer."

That is what we are voting on. Did I state that correctly?

A PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Okay. Hordusky?

MR. HORDUSKY: No.

MS. CROSS: Eisenbeis?

MS. EISENBEIS: No.

MS. CROSS: Walter?

MR. WALTER: Aye.

MS. CROSS: Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Abstain.

MS. CROSS: Oh, abstain? Okay. Morton?

MR. MORTON: Aye.

MS. CROSS: Smith?

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MS. CROSS: Wilkins?

MR. WILKINS: Aye.

MS. CROSS: Tulis?

MS. TULIS: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Jacob?

MS. JACOB: Aye.

MS. CROSS: Veatch?

DR. VEATCH: No.

MS. CROSS: Prudden?

MS. PRUDDEN: Aye.

DR. VEATCH: May I ask a question here about what was deleted here? I am still not sure. Did we also get rid of the part about being forwarded to Depository Libraries, filed with the National Archives and Records Service, and listed in Monthly Catalog available for purchase?

MS. CROSS: Yes, that was in that section.

DR. VEATCH: Yeah, that is what I thought. Okay.

MS. CROSS: The Council -- there were nine "yes", three "no", and one abstention. The motion carries.

Now, you want to consider what Jim has said. I don't know whether that wording needs to be included in there. I would think that -- now do the transcripts go to National

Archives, all these places, and any other summaries -- do they end up --

Joe is shaking his head yes, so --

DR. VEATCH: It is a sales item, is that correct?

MS. CROSS: Mark, do you know? What is a sales item?

MR. SCULLY: I don't believe any of the three have been a sales item. Someone from from Sales could correct me. The three I'm referring to are the Annual Report, those that have been issued, the summaries that are published soon after the Council meetings in Administrative Notes newsletter, and then the full transcript. I don't believe any three of those -- if there is anyone from Sales who can correct me on that here. Tad, do you happen to know?

MR. DOWNING: I doubt it very much.

MR. SCULLY: I don't believe they are. We can confirm that and let you know later this morning.

MS. CROSS: All right, thank you.

On our agenda we have Mr. Broome, from the Bureau of the Census. I do not wish to delay his presentation any longer. Are you ready to speak?

Mr. Broome is the Chief of the Mapping Operations Branch at the Bureau of the Census. He is speaking to us today because there are certain products that we have become accustomed to having in the past that perhaps will not be available to us in the same format. So he is going to talk about some 1990 Census products, how we can obtain them, how they will be created, and so forth.

We are pleased to have you with us today, Mr. Broome.

STATEMENT OF FREDERIC R. BROOME

MR. BROOME: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I really did not want to interrupt that dog fight. That was a very enthusiastic -- I like to see groups when they really get into contributing to their organization and it is good, really good.

As a matter of fact, I had the opportunity, sitting back there, to get the feel for just how serious you are about this concept of information, data storage. I have a computer lecture, so obviously it comes out on computer paper. We have a difficult problem here in tearing it.

All right. As was stated, I am the Chief of the Mapping Operations Branch, so my responsibilities include the kinds of maps that we will prepare, both for taking the Census and in presenting the Census, some of which, certainly the latter, will fall in your collections, and some of the former will.

As a member of a federal agency, I must bracket this entire presentation with the following caveat. This paper presents only the most tentative and preliminary thoughts on the subject, and in no way should be construed as representing official Census Bureau plans or policy.

Even if I didn't give you that, most of you have dealt with the Government long enough to know that I could give you the official plans and policy right now, and go back to the office this afternoon and they could be changed. Take these for what they are worth. They are initial thoughts about how we are going to produce the maps and the possible impact on you, the interface with the rest of the world, and how people get and use the maps.

May I have the slides, please? Here it is right in front of me. Let's see what we have. Good!

Since the Statistical Atlas of 1870, maps depicting the results from censuses and surveys have appeared in U.S. Government publications. The production of statistical maps by the Government has included both page size and wall maps. As you can see down on the far end, I have one of the wall maps, and on the table I have many more examples of wall maps.

In addition to the statistical maps, the U.S. Bureau of the Census has made available reference maps showing base information such as the transportation net, water bodies, political and statistical boundaries involved in the collection and tabulation of the statistics. Some of the reference maps were printed and included with the published statistics. Other reference maps were merely duplicated upon special order or request to our agency.

Generally the special duplicated maps would fall in the category of the individual maps that the enumerator might use. I will make these available, but it is roughly this one in the upper corner here. You can see they are just simply small street maps used during the collection of the census.

MS. CROSS: Do you need some help holding it?

MR. BROOME: No, I think that is probably the last one. The rest of them I hope I have slides for.

Throughout the years the technology to produce maps has changed. The merging of photography and the printing process in the late eighteen hundreds was the beginning of a rapidly-changing map production technology. This is an example of the wall map.

Changes in the photolithographic process and in photo engraving fields have caused similar changes in the cartographic procedures to compliment these fields. The present-day cartographic procedures with their scribing open window negatives, photo-generated lettering, are vastly different from the pen-and-ink operations that we had just a hundred years ago.

Now the use of computer in the production of maps is beginning to be felt. The impact of the computer upon the production of maps is yet really to be fully seen. That is a surprise, because we have been generating maps by computer as far back as 1952. The first published volume showing maps generated by computer date back that far.

The myriad of output devices that are becoming available to us now and are in the laboratory development, plus the tremendous increase in the storage capacity of data storage devices and the almost explosive use of computers by the youth of today all combine together to suggest that the environment where the map production as we know it probably will be altered significantly. As a matter of fact, it probably will not even exist as we know it one hundred percent.

This paper will briefly examine some of the issues raised by the automation of cartographic production and how the U.S. Bureau of the Census plans to address them.

The Bureau's plans have not yet been finalized relative to the maps, their inclusion in publications, or their publication as separate items. Indeed, the plans are only in their early phases.

Part of that is technological. We cannot stand here today and tell you what will be. A slight digression here: in the early seventies I had the pleasure of being selected as one of the five individuals to work for the White House in the evaluation of all cartography for the entire Federal Government on the civilian side. We had access to the military side as well, and we made predictions. We went to the, what was then the Civil Service Commission. We got the rates of what it cost per cartographer and per draftsperson. We charted these; and, sure enough, exactly as you would suspect, the cost per employee was going like this (indicating.)

We took from published literature, the cost for computer equipment and cartographic equipment, if you will -- computer-controlled cartographic equipment -- to generate maps. Sure enough, the cost per map, if you will, was going like this (indicating.) We knew it could not keep going, because obviously you cannot make a map for negative cost. We figured it would bottom out and start back up around 1974-75.

We could not have been further from the truth, because at that time we had not anticipated the introduction of the microcomputer or the way that the public took it to heart. You ended up with microcomputers in about every third home -- certainly to play games, but they became familiar with the equipment. It became a tool to them. We didn't anticipate that!

We are not going to stand here today and tell you what kind of equipment will definitely be out there; but, certainly, we can stand here today and say what kind of equipment we suspect will be out there, and consequently what you are going to have to deal with and what we are going to have to deal with in making our maps.

At present, the Census Bureau does not foresee a major departure from recent publication policy. Selective reference maps will continue to be printed as part of the published data, such as we have here, and you saw earlier. This would be a map to go along with the printed data.

Some statistical maps will be included with the summary and special publications. Further, copies of unpublished but census-produced maps will continue to be made available upon special request.

Now, having said that, you say, "Well, okay, if the present map publication policy continues into the 1990s, then where is the problem?" You are going to have exactly what you are used to. It comes from the likelihood of there being fewer published documents and more and more data collected through electronic means in a non-printed media.

Just as microfilm reduced the need for the printed item to be on hand, the availability of data in computer-readable form is likely to reduce the need for the printed volume of statistics while at the same time increasing the amount of statistics present to the user.

Similarly, as copies of microfilm documents may be made upon demand, so can copies of statistical files be printed upon demand. The benefit of that is to the user. Only the statistics of interest need to be extracted and printed by the user. This latter capability results directly from the fact that, unlike microfilm, the computer-readable file is not an image, generally, but is merely a data file that can be manipulated as a data file.

The absence of an image in the computer-readable form of the distributed data introduces a problem for how we would provide maps to the user. One alternative is to print the maps in a volume or folio and make them available at the sites, which will be providing the data-search capability to the user. This is limiting, since the search is not likely to occur at one site within a library, or within a facility. The present trend is to make computer-readable files accessible to any site capable of connecting to the data storage facility, such as the library, the central computer facility, or some other service.

The next alternative is to provide the maps as an electronic image, integrated with a statistical data file. That holds some promise. We have optical disks. I think there was something over there, the Library of Congress Optical Disk Program, which is a fantastic way of reducing a large quantity of printed materials to a media that you can search, scan, and then decide whether you want to actually go to the hard copy or not. You can analyze it.

This, however, poses two problems for us. First is that, while some statistical data is provided today, and nothing more than an electronic version of the published tables, users in the post-1990 era probably will not be satisfied with a restrictive format of that nature.

The second problem is the electronic images of the map. If the maps are constrained to the resolution and size of the common display terminals, or even to the newer, high-resolution ones, as a matter of fact, that is right. The image detail will almost be unreadable.

The electronic map images could be made larger than the display screen, and user would simply just pan around inside of the image and look around. Unfortunately, this removes the ability to see the whole image, or even larger sites, because when multiple panels are combined again on the screen, again the detail disappears.

Even such relatively simple items as street names, which can be printed in six or eight point type on a published map become unreadable at that size when displayed on a Raster (phonetic) display terminal which uses, say, a five by eight dot matrix to make up the characters two-tenths of an inch high. That is the smallest they can do. Or, if you decide to plot them, you use smaller dots. When you start clustering the dots together, the cotton-picking letter just disappears into oblivion.

Further complicating the situation is that the hard-copy output devices have different capabilities and limitations than that of the terminals. Many times the hard copy devices have larger image areas and greater resolution than the terminals. That is a positive. But, it does also mean that the map prepared for display on the terminal for the person to cruise around inside will not look better when output through the hard-copy device.

Likewise, while it is relatively easy to use color terminals to overcome some of the display limitations, color hard-copy devices are less common. Even if you could get one that matched the color on the screen, and that is sort of a unique difficulty.

If you have a color terminal and you merely put it to a color hard-copy device, I will lay you odds nine-chances-out-of-ten your colors will not match. If you are keying on very precise colors to represent information on that screen, when you make the map you will be very disappointed, because, in all probability, the map colors will be different.

Therefore, storing the maps as electronic images for general-purpose access creates more problems, in our opinion, than it solves.

Aside from the maps provided with the tabulated statistics, the Census Bureau receives numerous requests for other kinds of maps. Requests of this type range from requests at national level for maps covering the whole nation, such as this one showing the relationship of income and education -- two variables at once.

I will digress a minute. I love this map. I really do, because it tells you the obvious. I am a geographer by education, and one of the definitions of a geographer is a person who makes an intensive study of the obvious.

(Laughter.)

If you look at this, in the lower corner here (indicating) you got two variables. One is education, the other is income. Going from yellow to the high is increased education. Going from this side to that side is increased income. The yellow zones show that people in counties with low education, low income. The purple, or darker colors, show high education, high income. If you are up in this zone, you are in green, which says you have a high education, low income. You've got that through here, out here. We give people high school educations, but then no jobs.

This one right here is red. It is kind of interesting. There were some Indians sitting up there that discovered they did not need education, as long as they had minerals sitting on their reservation, and they controlled them. So they sell the minerals, and they have a very high income, relative to their education.

This is the kinds of maps that you can make available to the public for them, and we chose to publish this one, or a few of this kind, in an electronic form. Your user, your customer, can come out there and throw various variables up there.

Oh, don't get me wrong. There is not necessarily a statistical correlation represented here. This is only a spacial correlation. On the national level -- down to small town, USA, where the customer may want to see the political statistical boundaries of their area, their own unique area, with their own statistics. We are not very likely, at a national level, to make available this kind of map to each and every city, town, village, etc., because for one thing, there would be too many. For another thing, we don't know what variables interest the local people.

Even when the Census Bureau is able to accommodate these requests, the cost to the customer and the government --

time and effort needed to generate maps of this nature discourage the customer. The Bureau of the Census does try to accommodate the requests for Federal, state and local agencies, and even public. But generally, such requests cannot be fulfilled due to our operational needs.

Many times the request for a specific topic may simply be made to the depository librarian or a map governments document section and the unavailability of the map terminates the search at that point. No one goes further. These are lost opportunities to provide information to the customer.

What does the TIGER system portend? TIGER: Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing System. That is a fancy name for the geographic portion of the 1990 Census effort. This will underpin all of our work throughout the decade of the nineties.

Basically, TIGER is a file that contains all the GO codes that link the geographic areas to the statistical data files, and all the cartographic features required to produce both the field collection maps and the publication maps. The TIGER system consists of the TIGER file -- actually it is a group of files, and all the computer programs, operating procedures and specifications necessary to provide geographic support for all census activities through the decade of the nineties.

In that one paragraph, I made the statement that we will not be producing our maps manually for 1990. We will be producing them from a computer file -- the electronic cartography. The results will be hard copy, I will grant you that, but the actual base will be otherwise.

Now, the TIGER file is built around a national cartographic data base, which is being developed by the U.S. Geological Survey, from their one-to-a-hundred-thousand-scale maps. This is a cooperative effort between the two agencies to provide a common cartographic structure upon which the map products may be based.

The Census Bureau, in addition to helping USGS produce the data base, uses the data base as the primary structure on which we build TIGER.

The U.S. Geological Survey, for you map depository librarians, is providing a national cartographic data base, and that is going to be in digital form. You are used to getting the one-to-a-hundred-thousand published sheets. You probably will still continue, but if someone wishes to view things, in all probability -- and I cannot speak for my sister agency. In all probability, that file will be the one that will really be cruised most often from anything other than one local site.

Okay, the Census Bureau takes the U.S. cartographic files known as Digital Line Graph, or DLG, and we reformat those into TIGER, after we put in the stuff that they need. To this we then add our codes, our features, street names and other information needed for census operations.

You say, "Well, okay, why do you need to do that?" Well, it is quite simple. The Census Bureau needs all the street names, and if you have ever looked at a U.S. Geological Survey map, somewhere between five and ten percent of the streets are named. We name everything, including alleys. We have to get the addresses for everything, because we do an electronic match of where people are.

The TIGER file then will be used to generate the field collection maps, and -- well, let's go this way. Here is what the TIGER file will do for us. It will help us in the assignment of the geographic locations, it will provide the geographic structure -- and this is an important one, by the way. I will tell you why in a minute. It will provide the ability for us to generate the maps in an automated fashion.

As I said, the TIGER file will be used to generate the field collection maps in the taking of the census, and in the control files -- in the generating of the control files, and in the tabulation of the data.

This integrated nature of the TIGER system removes many of the problems that we have had in the past. I am stating this publicly, but I would appreciate it if it stayed off the record. You probably already know it, but if you take one of our Census maps and you take one of our published volumes, and you look down through there, and you look at the same geographic areas, you may not find that the codes are the same. Why? Because they were generated as separate operations in different phases.

We attempted, when we made changes here, to filter the changes through, but they were essentially manual operations, and the changes simply could not get through. We were making over three hundred thousand maps in a period over just a few year. That is a lot of maps to generate manually. We hired more cartographers -- have you ever seen twelve hundred cartographers in one room?

(Laughter.)

Talk about a sweat shop!

(Laughter.)

I will tell you something. We called them cartographers, or draftsmen, or cartotechs. They were people who were desperate for a job, and we were desperate for a body. That is part of the reason. But with the TIGER file, if a change is made, if we make an error, at least it will be reflected in all the volumes and the same error will be everywhere!

(Laughter.)

The use of the TIGER file as the single source for the information needed for each phase of the census operation will tie the statistical data to the maps in a fashion that will be useful, both to us and to the ultimate customer.

My next section here deals with the impact of the service upon libraries, the impact of the way we are doing it on the service of libraries. Current evidence points to the conclusion that there will be fewer Census maps published in multiple copies, either in single sheets or as part of Census volumes. This is in absolute numbers of copies, as well as in variety of statistical topics.

This reduction has little to do with the government's ability to produce more maps in a more timely manner and at less expense, nor is it a reduction in the ability to respond to special map production requests. No, the digital nature of the cartographic and statistical data at that time will most certainly provide for exactly those capabilities.

The reduction will be due to the increased ability of the Government to provide a more flexible and responsive statistical service to itself and to the public. There still will be a small corps of carefully-selected map types and data topics published in hard copy for mass distribution, but then -- this is after 1990 -- the users will be able to play a greater role in the map-making process.

The integration of the statistical and the geographic digital data bases will provide the ability to produce maps upon demand, and will reduce the requirement to predefine the subject, prepare the art work, and publish and distribute the maps. The user will thus be free to select the subjects of interest for their mapping.

The impact upon libraries and their function will mostly be in the way they structure the hard copy production services and the equipment that they use to respond to information requests, at least in our opinion. One would expect to see terminals for users distributed much like you have microfilm readers distributed today. The type of terminal will depend upon the service to be provided at that point.

Again, just as some microfilm readers also have printers, some computer terminals for viewing data and/or maps may have hard copy output devices attached directly to them.

For multipage printouts or large maps, there may be a central facility within the library, or even one servicing several libraries within a geographic area. Libraries of the future may become holders of digital data files, as well as published volumes. Likewise, map libraries may become holders of digital cartographic data bases, as well as published atlases and separate sheets.

Now, it is not likely that the move to information in digital format is going to stop. More likely, it will accelerate. The question then becomes one of where the user will go to get their information needs satisfied. Will it be to the libraries? I sincerely hope so. You have been doing business for years. I would hate to see it transferred over to a central computer facility -- but that is my personal prejudice.

It is an exciting future, but to be ready, the libraries have to begin now. I have been with the government long enough, again, to know -- by the way, when I started with the government, my hair was not gray. My gray hair does not come from right; it comes from making mistakes. I don't have many mistakes left to make, thank goodness.

If you are going to train personnel, if you are going to get equipment, and you have miserably-restricted budgets -- I have seen some of them. They are worse than mine -- you are going to have to start now. You are going to have to start tickling the people up above and getting the powers behind you, to be prepared to fulfill the information needs of the nineties.

The Census Bureau is preparing the TIGER file. That is all I can address. I cannot address our statistical data files. I know we are preparing those, too. Within our ability, we are ready to share the file and the technology, as we move into this new information era. Frankly, I have a few more years before I retire, so I hope I am there with you to see what happens.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

(Applause.)

This is an offer open to everybody, but map librarians in particular: I have no intention of carrying all these things back to the office, so if you wanted extra copies of maps, please feel free to raid that corner.

MS. CROSS: I am letting Council get back to their seats, then we will have some time for questions.

Thank you, Mr. Broome, for coming and giving this presentation. Council, do you have questions?

MS. EISENBEIS: Good morning. I heard you talk at Cartogaphie Users Advisory Council last year in January. I think I am fortunate enough -- I have heard this presentation three times, and I think it takes a while to absorb what you are talking about.

I see this as a problem for the data user services group that you have in the Census Bureau. I think they do a good job training us to use the print products, but, as all of us know, there is a direct relationship between our users' ability to use the data and the ability to visually see a map.

I don't think our ability to deal with the Census print product has even gotten to the level that we all wish we had. Our facility is not that great, but it is kind of overwhelming to hear, you know, your wonderfully articulate enthusiasm for all this. I think, probably, everyone is kind of quaking.

I see it as a trend of the Census Bureau to transfer the cost from the Census Bureau to the individual. I see that as one problem, and I see the second problem in training, and the third problem in having the reference tools in our libraries to be able to even make referrals. I do not think all of us are going to have the equipment, even though we can look into the twenty-first century for this. I do not think we are going to be doing it as soon as you would like, or I would like.

MR. BROOME: I agree with the concern that was voiced in there. The concern is, it appears that in our rush to automation, we have forgotten the user. Partially by way of defense, I would like to say that our efforts towards automation were primarily to help the taxpayer and to help the user to have more accurate data.

Now, if along the way we have transferred some of the cost -- and I won't deny that. I won't accept it, but I won't deny it either -- it is tantamount to what is happening out in the counties and cities, where the governments are very rapidly putting all of their tax records and their tax maps up on the computer, and where you used to be able to walk into an office and say, "I'd like to look at this folio of tax maps." It is your right as a citizen.

All of a sudden, you now have to pay for a computer run or terminal time, so the cost got transferred without you having much say so.

What I am offering here is somewhat of an out. We are sensitive to that need, and I agree: the Bureau would probably -- should -- you know, our Data Users Service group should probably begin addressing how we train people and how we help to provide the same service at essentially the come cost. If you have any ideas, we certainly would welcome them.

MR. WALTER: I have two quick questions, I hope. One, in your indications, the Census Bureau is willing to share these map files. Do you anticipate the sharing being on an on-line access from the world as a whole, or do you anticipate that buying the computer tapes, much as is done now with the summary tape files and the individual institution's having to put that file up on their own computer and draw it off their own computer?

MR. BROOME: Personal observation, not an official one: I got burned on the microcomputer thing. I am not likely to get burned again. I see the laser disk, not as a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

storage vehicle for images, but as a storage for the TIGER-type file in a digital form.

I see the microcomputers that are out today, and many of you have them sitting in your office doing word processing, as being quite sufficient for cruising through those files. I do not believe we will be talking about a central facility we are sharing; but, rather, delivery of something like a TIGER file, either in digital disk or tape.

MR. WALTER: Secondly, that wonderful map you had up there that had the special relationship between educational attainment and income, is that a print product that is available somewhere?

MR. BROOME: It is a print product that we ran off as an experiment, and it became a popular seller. I have a few dozen copies still left back in the office. If you will contact me by phone, I will have the secretary send you some.

We have some others too: the relation of low birth weight babies to infant mortality, size of farm to income, and things like that. By the way, size of farm to income looks almost like educational attainment. Small farms, small income, low education, all in the same area.

MS. CROSS: Other questions from Council?

(No response.)

Audience? Yes?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, Bill Thompson, from the University of Massachusetts. I have heard this presentation more than once, as well. Each time I have heard it except this time, someone has said something about the progress that is being made by the USGS and by the Bureau of the Census in getting the TIGER system up and running. I wonder if you might give us some idea where you are with the TIGER system, and can we actually expect that when the 1990 census is taken, and when products start coming out, that the TIGER system will be up and running and people will be able to access it completely.

MR. BROOME: This one I will have to give you the official answer. It's not bad, because the official answer and my personal observations are very close.

Yes, we are well underway with the TIGER, and with a few possible exceptions -- that is always dangerous with a national program, when you are dealing with hundreds of thousands of entities spread over the nation -- millions, actually. With a few possible exceptions, we are on target for the completion of the U.S. Geological Survey digital line graph version by the summer of 1987.

We expect to be online with TIGER by the Fall of '88, because in summer of '88, I have to start making maps from TIGER. Now, since I can flow my production across time, I don't have to be through by that time.

By 1990, I fully expect, with appropriate inquiries from outside, that TIGER, in one form or another, will be available, just exactly like the data files will be available in the same schedule, maybe even ahead of it, because TIGER, essentially, is used to produce the data files, and we probably will have to be through with TIGER before.

Another point in passing: you may be aware that the U.S. Geological Survey just released a text version of the digital line graph data file. If you contact USGS, they will make available one of the quadrangles so you can see what that file will look like. We have yet to release one of TIGER -- now this is modify somewhat what I said -- partially because we do not know what TIGER is going to look like yet. We will not know until it is completed. That is the truth.

MS. CROSS: Any other questions or comments? Julia?

MS. WALLACE: Since no one else has asked this, I guess I will. I'm Julia Wallace, from Minneapolis Public

Library.

I think we are looking here at an interesting example of something that was brought up yesterday at the OMB discussion, and that is access versus dissemination. In the past, we have had these maps disseminated and available in our depositories. Now, instead, they will, in theory, be accessible to those who ask for them and pay for them, but they will not be sitting there ready for people to use.

Some of us are already dealing with Census data being available through the State Data Centers. You did not mention the State Data Centers, but I guess I would be interested in how the Census Bureau views the delivery of these particular products through the State Data Centers, as opposed to through depository libraries, and how that cooperation will be facilitated.

MR. BROOME: You are right. I did not explicitly mention the State Data Centers. I did mention that there might be a facility servicing many libraries in a geographic area. That would have been a sentence in my paper, had I put it in. Yes, the State Data Centers could serve that facility. That would be up to the state. We would support whatever decisions were made in that area. That might be an excellent way to concentrate whatever technical expertise you require to do the mapping.

As far as fewer maps being available, I was only reflecting what appears to be a trend in the published version as well. If printed documents are reduced in number, then any maps associated with them will probably be reduced in number.

MS. CROSS: Does anyone wish to ask any questions? Council?

(No response.)

Okay, Mr. Broome, thank you so much for being here. We appreciate your coming and the information you shared with us.

Since we have a little bit of time before our scheduled break, and before we start on the recommendations, I want to mention a few items of what we termed "suggestions."

When the Council met last night to deliberate over our recommendations, we talked about a few things that could have possibly been one, but we felt, because we've been able at this meeting to have a working relationship with people in GPO from the Library Programs Service, that just in discussion we were able to accommodate some things. Some things had come out in the meetings, too, that have already been said they would be taken care of. But I wanted to highlight those so that you're aware, if you did have that particular item of concern, and you were wondering how it was being taken care of.

As you are aware, Kathleen Eisenbeis is our resident map expert, and she has made some very excellent suggestions, in terms of map training for documents librarians, and pointing out that documents librarians need to know what map librarians know, in order to make their job easier. So instead of doing a recommendation on map training for documents librarians, we said that we would understand or assume that that would then be another component of the Education Task Force, as it prepares its rationale for the depository library program of training.

The map indexes have been taken care of by the USGS. That is an item, too, that was discussed the other day, and so that concern has really been addressed.

We had some discussion about the demise of Public Documents Highlights. One of the documents librarians had spoken to me about whether the Administrative Notes, in essence, replace could the Public Documents Highlights in the sense that it serves as a communication vehicle for the depository community.

In talking with Mark Scully, he indicated that he did not see why that could not happen. I do not know whether sending your letters to Mark directly, or whatever, but short of overthrow of the Government or something like that, most everything will be put in that is appropriate in Administrative Notes in order to better serve the documents community as a communication vehicle, so Administrative Notes can be in some way expanded.

Do you want to say anything, Mark?

MR. SCULLY: Mark Scully, GPO. I just want to say that we will be publishing within the month, something in Administrative Notes by way of guidelines for submitting, what to submit and where it should be submitted, and so forth. So it is, in general, instructions for all depository librarians who would like to submit materials to be published in Administrative Notes.

MS. CROSS: As I am mentioning these, Council, if you wish to add anything to what I am saying, please let me know that you wish to speak.

Since the Classification Manual has been prepared, we have seen the draft copy that is ready to go to press. We were discussing the need for copies of that being made available to the library educators. The suggestion was that this would be added to the package that Marketing is preparing for library educators, so that would take care of that, without us going through the formal recommendation route.

There was, also, the concern about lack of sufficient copies of the recommendations for the attendees, the ones that were printed in Administrative Notes as a total package. Again, we have talked with LPS and told them of our concern to make sure that in the next go-around, we will have plenty of copies available when people arrive, so that you have them immediately, and you won't have to wait, or we run out, and so forth. So that will be taken care. That is more of just a housekeeping item.

Our discussion concerning reprints and preprints, Mark said that he will put an item of information in Administrative Notes and send out the change regarding how the depository may handle those. That will be officially in there so there is something to refer to; not just our discussion here.

We realize that we didn't complete discussion on that recommendation pertaining to the expansion of the List of

Classes and item numbers and so forth, so what we have done, we have appointed a committee, The Council has appointed a committee to study the item numbers and report back at the Spring meeting. The Council members serving on that are Susan Tulis, who will serve as the Chair; Marion Carroll, our Secretary, and Peggy Prudden.

They will study this issue. We heard suggestions that we do away with the item numbers. We heard discussion about how it is difficult to add item numbers because of our limited system, and so forth. So they are going to study the issue and report back to us in the Spring.

Also, when I was talking about Administrative Notes, there was one other suggestion that was made, and that is that key policy or informational notices issued in Administrative Notes be identified with distinctive headers to insure that depositories follow the policy or the action that is in effect.

In other words, there will be something there to call your attention to the fact that there is a change or addition. If you wish to pull it out or xerox it and add it to your depository manual, that would be your prerogative, but we will identify it. We have asked LPS to identify those things to make it easier for the depository community.

Is there anything else, Council, that we discussed that you wish to mention before we proceed?

(No response.)

Also, what I have asked is that the various Council members participate in presenting the recommendations. Last night (this is a very sharing experience to write the recommendations), my job was made a lot easier by the talented people who serve on this body in proposing recommendations. I have asked the various people who brought these forth to read the recommendation, and answer any questions or entertain comments about it, as we prepare to vote.

Unless there is something else that needs to be said at this moment, let's take a brief break, then we will reconvene at 10:15 and begin on the recommendations.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MS. CROSS: Earlier this morning I saw a friendly face in the audience, Jim Livsey. I do not see him now, and I meant to recognize him at that time.

Jim Livsey has been a friend of depository librarians for a number of years, and he is going to retire within a very short time; I think by either the end of this month or the first of next month. We wish him well in his retirement, but we will miss him, and we will lose a friend in GPO.

I also see Gil Baldwin in the back. I think Gil's status has changed since last we saw him. I think everyone has bemoaned the fact, Gil, that you are not still cataloging maps and so forth. It is good to see you here today.

As I mentioned before the break, I have asked Council members to present the various recommendations. There was one rationale that was -- the rationale for number twelve was left off. It is being reproduced and will be available by the time we get to that, so everybody will have a copy.

Beginning with number one, Bob Walter, would you come to the podium and please read that? I think all you need to do is read the recommendation. You don't need to read the rationale.

MR. WALTER: I would like to preclude a couple of possible questions, though. One, it is implicit in this resolution that the Monthly Catalog would not change at the moment at all. The product would continue as it has been.

We have been assured by GPO staff that at any time after a six-month period, they can go ahead and change the product.

The recommendation reads: "The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the GPO Marketing Department survey current and past subscribers to the Monthly Catalog and report the results of the survey at the spring Council meeting. The collected data should include characteristics of libraries who currently purchase the Monthly Catalog, the characteristics of libraries which have dropped subscriptions, information regarding online or cumulative products used in place of the Monthly Catalog, and the usefulness of one-step look-up of various indexes which are now produced in the Monthly Catalog. A copy of the survey should also be sent to all depository libraries."

It is also implicit in this recommendation that they are not limited to those particular items to survey.

MS. CROSS: Council, Kathleen?

MS. EISENBEIS: Just as you said that, I realized we really should address what we were asked to do, and that is say we recommend that they don't do anything at this time. It may be implicit, but I think we ought to say it, because that is what people will look for when they read it. That would serve to inform other people. I will work on a sentence.

MS. CROSS: All right. Jim?

DR. VEATCH: Jay Young had asked us to consider adding two new data elements to the expanded index. We never did that, either. Should we not maybe ask for that, because there seems to be some disagreement about whether those elements should or should not be in that expanded index. Should we ask for that to be put on the survey also?

MR. WALTER: I think that is in there, Jim. It is certainly not limited to that. Anything that they feel is necessary, the staff feels necessary, we are certainly not trying to limit what they should do. We do what those specific elements and anything else that they feel is necessary. Certainly, if they are interested in that, they will do it, but I certainly look at that as being in the last portion.

May we add the last sentence, "Pending the results, the decision to change the format should be postponed."

MS. CROSS: All right, you said, "Pending the results of the survey, changing the format should be postponed."

MR. WALTER: That is correct, "The decision to change the format should be postponed."

MS. CROSS: All right. Any other comments Council?

(No response.)

Does anyone from the audience wish to speak? Lois?

MS. MILLS: I would hope, also, that it would be assumed, and maybe should be precisely stated that the survey, which was recently completed on the Monthly Catalog format, should be withdrawn and reconsidered.

MR. WALTER: I think that was brought up last night. Staff understands it.

MS. MILLS: We want to be sure they understand it.

MS. CROSS: Peyton?

MR. NEAL: Peyton Neal. I would offer one suggestion, and I have not talked to the GPO people in doing so, but I think perhaps you will see the wisdom.

Rather than charge the Marketing Department with doing the survey themselves, which I think is implied the way the resolution reads, I would suggest that you merely recommend that GPO do the survey, and leave the Government Printing Office the latitude of perhaps going to the private sector with the sources sought in order to elicit a lot of information that has already been collected by member companies in the private sector, who are dealing in bibliographic products and services, and the marketing demographics of that.

I think potentially a lot of this information, not just for library customers, but for other customers of government publications, products and services is already out there and existing. Whether people who have that from the private sector would be forthcoming with that, I cannot say, but certainly by affording the GPO the opportunity to publish the "sources sought", notice in the Commerce Business Daily you might find that a good many private sector companies that have investigated this market in some detail would be offering then to contract to do all or a part of such a survey and save the duplication of a lot of effort.

MR. WALTER: I will go on here. One question I would have in regards to that: number one, I certainly do not think it would preclude GPO from doing that, although the Marketing Department could be struck from the recommendation. It certainly would not hurt my feelings any.

However, I think Council is definitely concerned with the time factor here. We would like to get this format situation settled as soon as possible. That is why we asked to have that completed by the Spring meeting. If they did go through that procedure -- Peyton, perhaps you would like to address that.

I am wondering if we could get all of that done in that amount of time. There was even a question whether GPO, if they did it themselves, would be able to get it done in that amount of time.

MS. CROSS: Any other comment? Don?

MR. FOSSEDAL: Thank you for the resolution and Peyton's comments. It is somewhat moot, because we do not have a market researcher in the Market Research Department. That is one of the things I wanted to hire a couple of years ago, and it has fallen by the wayside. This was a good reminder today that maybe one of my 950 slots might be good as a market researcher. In the interim, it might have to go outside to do it right. I think it was a good suggestion, and I thank Peyton for it.

MR. WALTER: Given that, I would amend the recommendation to strike the words "Marketing Department."

MS. CROSS: We should also strike the word "the" before "GPO." Just say that GPO survey current and past --

MR. WALTER: Right.

MS. CROSS: All right, any other changes?

(No response.)

All right, Council are you ready to vote? I do now have an alphabetical list. I will call your name, and I will tally as we go along.

Carroll? We are voting on the recommendation.

MS. CARROLL: Aye.

MS. CROSS: Eisenbeis?

MS. EISENBEIS: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Hordusky?

MR. HORDUSKY: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Jacob?

MS. JACOB: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Mason?

MS. MASON: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Morton?

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Prudden?

MS. PRUDDEN: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Raum?

MR. RAUM: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Smith?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Tulis?

MS. TULIS: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Veatch?

DR. VEATCH: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Walter?

MR. WALTER: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Wilkins?

MR. WILKINS: Yes.

MS. CROSS: All right, that is unanimous, and the recommendation passed.

All right, number two? Diane, please?

MS. SMITH: "The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Government Printing Office publish technical documentation to accompany the Monthly Catalog tapes describing GPO's use of MARC fields and subfields in the preparation of bibliographic records, including but not limited to which fields have been used, the dates of their use, and the use of the fields and subfields not defined in the official MARC formats. The Depository Library Council also recommends to the Public Printer that representatives from the Government Printing Office and the Library of Congress' Cataloging Distribution Service begin discussion to verify that any changes made in the Monthly

Catalog tapes are clearly understood by each agency and to establish procedures by which additional documentation will be produced as a result of any changes made to the tapes or to bibliographic practices."

MS. CROSS: Council, any comments or questions about this?

(No response.)

As you recall, we had an excellent presentation by Carolyn Jamison from Penn State, and I think the points made at that time indicated what was needed.

It is pretty straight forward. Are you ready to vote?

Carroll? We are voting on number two, recommendation number two. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Aye.

MS. CROSS: Eisenbeis?

MS. EISENBEIS: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Hordusky?

MR. HORDUSKY: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Jacob?

MS. JACOB: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Mason?

MS. MASON: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Morton?

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Prudden?

MS. PRUDDEN: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Raum?

MR. RAUM: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Smith?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Tulis?

MS. TULIS: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Veatch?

DR. VEATCH: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Walter?

MR. WALTER: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Wilkins?

MR. WILKINS: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Okay, that recommendation is passed unanimously.

Kathleen, if you would like to stay at your seat, that is okay.

MS. EISENBEIS: Do you want me to stand up, or do you want me to sit here?

MS. CROSS: Whichever.

MS. EISENBEIS: Would it help if I stand up?

MS. CROSS: It probably would.

MS. EISENBEIS: "The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the request for proposal document for the cleanup of the Monthly Catalog tapes be sent to Council members at the time of its release to those attending the November 14th, 1985 meeting announced in the October 10th, 1985 issue of The Commerce Business Daily. Council further recommends that it be kept apprised of developments with regard to this contract."

MS. CROSS: Would you like to discuss?

MR. FOSSEDAL: I would counter-recommend to Council that they remove the pejorative word "cleanup". We don't consider them dirty, and they use "update", please.

MS. CROSS: I think Council will be glad to. Kathleen, would you --

MS. EISENBEIS: Yes, I'll accept that -- "for the update of the Monthly Catalog".

MS. CROSS: Any other comments of Council?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Does anyone from the audience wish to comment or ask a question for clarification?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Are you ready to vote? All right, on

Recommendation Number Three:

Carroll: Yes.
Eisenbeis: Yes.
Hordusky: Yes.
Jacob: Yes.
Mason: Yes.
Morton: Yes.
Prudden: Yes.
Raum: Yes.
Smith: Yes.
Tulis: Yes.
Veatch: Yes.
Walter: Yes.
Wilkins: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Again, Recommendation Number Three carries unanimously.

Bruce, would you please read Number Four.

MR. MORTON: "The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO plan, fund and implement an adequate, integrated, automated support system for the Library Programs Service."

MS. CROSS: Would you like us to spell out "LPS"?

Comments? Questions? Okay, Bob.

MR. WALTER: I just request that the period at the end of the rationale be changed to an exclamation point.

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: Two exclamation points -- three.

MR. FOSSEDAL: As Bob is a Spanish linguist, I have a certain knowledge of Spanish. Do you want an inverted exclamation point in the beginning?

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: All right. Any other comments, Council, or questions?

(No response.)

All right. Audience, would you like to?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Are you ready to vote? On Recommendation Number Four:

Carroll: Yes.

Eisenbeis: Yes.

Hordusky: Yes.

Jacob: Yes.

Mason: Yes.

Morton: Yes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Prudden: Yes.
Raum: Yes.
Smith: Yes.
Tulis: Yes.
Veatch: Yes.
Walter: Yes.
Wilkins: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Again, Recommendation Number Four unanimously is passed.

Diane -- keep your seat.

MS. SMITH: "The Depository Library Council is pleased that the Library Programs Service is working toward the development of the 1987 Biennial Survey, and the Council enthusiastically assigns Bruce Morton as its representative to review the proposed statistical packages developed for the survey."

MS. CROSS: Bruce enthusiastically -- we all love you -- receives that.

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: Does anyone, either Council or audience, wish to ask a question or comment?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Are you ready to vote? On Recommendation Number Five about appointing Bruce as Council's representative, please vote:

Carroll: Yes.

Eisenbeis: Yes.

Hordusky: Yes.

Jacob: Yes.

Mason: Yes.

Morton: Yes.

Prudden: Yes.

Raum: Yes.

Smith: Yes.

Tulis: Yes.

Veatch: Yes.

Walter: Yes.

Wilkins: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Unanimously passed, Recommendation Five. Bruce, it's your turn on Number Six.

MR. MORTON: "The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that in any long-range planning effort for the Depository Library Program, that the Depository Library Council be appropriately involved and used in its advisory capacity."

MS. CROSS: Thank you. Any further comments or questions? Council?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Anyone from the audience?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Are you ready to vote?

Carroll: Yes.

Eisenbeis: Yes.

Hordusky: Yes.

Jacob: Yes.

Mason: Yes.

Morton: Yes.

Prudden: Yes.

Raum: Yes.

Smith: Yes.

Tulis: Yes.

Veatch: Yes.

Walter: Yes.

Wilkins: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Unanimously, Recommendation Number Six passed.

MS. EISENBEIS: Jennie, could I ask for some information this morning? Has that group been named? We couldn't come up with a name. For lack of a name, we just called it the Long-Range Planning Effort. I know it's a weekly coffee klatch, but I mean --

MS. HODUSKY: It's a lot more than that.

MR. FOSSEDAL: We do drink a lot of coffee there.

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: Is there a name for your meetings, and should we refer to it?

MR. FOSSEDAL: For now, we will name it the Depository Library Long-Range Study Group.

MS. EISENBEIS: Until you come up with a good acronym, we'll accept that.

MR. FOSSEDAL: You'll have to accept it if I name it.

(Laughter.)

MR. FOSSEDAL: Depository Library Long-Range Study Group -- you'd better check the acronym, though, Kathleen, before --

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: It doesn't make sense to me -- DLCLRSG.

MR. FOSSEDAL: It's no worse than FLIC and FLAC.

MS. CROSS: Council, do you wish to have that name officially put into the recommendation?

MS. EISENBEIS: I think it would serve to give it a name. I have a hard time referring to things in notes, minutes, articles when something is not named. We can all refer to it by the same name -- I would like to have it on record. We need some way to start referring to this.

MR. VEATCH: I had thought it was GPO Long-Range Planning Group; so, it's helpful to know that it is Depository Library Long-Range Planning Group.

MS. HODUSKI: There is a GPO Long-Range Study that is all of GPO, but this group is just Depository Library.

MS. SMITH: I would just be adverse to naming it a specific thing because we're talking about more than just this one group. We're talking about any long-range planning we would like to be involved in. I don't think we want to name this group.

MR. FOSSEDAL: You want to be involved in long-range planning over electronic photocomposition in the year 2022 or something?

MS. CARROLL: We have the opportunity to decline to be involved.

MS. CROSS: I think if it's appropriate. We said for the Council to "be appropriately involved". If it's not appropriate for the Council to be involved, then, I'm assuming it wouldn't be.

MR. FOSSEDAL: I believe in Government in the sunshine. I think that I've been pretty cooperative in keeping people involved, and I will do what's appropriate. I have no problem with this. I thought you just wanted me to name the group. I think it's a good idea Kathleen has. How about the Depository Study Group, just so that we have a nice, short acronym -- DSG. That sounds like some food additive.

(Laughter.)

MS. EISENBEIS: Jennie, I don't mind it's not in the resolution. I'm just pleased to get a name.

MS. CROSS: All right. Bruce.

MR. MORTON: I just wanted to reiterate that I think the recommendation as it now stands says exactly what we want to convey.

MR. FOSSEDAL: You will be kept informed appropriately on any issue of importance to Council and to the American people, to your patrons and short term, we will call it Depository Study Group. When we come with the OTA, JCP, GPO, GAO study, we'll certainly want your input on that.

MS. CROSS: Thank you. Let's move onto Recommendation Seven. Susan.

MS. TULIS: The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service fill out-of-print claims with a microfiche copy if a microfiche master exists.

MS. CROSS: Our English people, should we have hyphens in "out-of-print"?

Okay. We did leave that out last night.

Any further comments or questions? Council?

(No response.)

Does anyone in the audience wish to make a statement?

MS. FORBES: Olive Forbes, LBJ Public Affairs Library. I hope the out-of-print includes rainchecks that aren't fulfilled.

MS. CROSS: I think it does. Susan, didn't we mention that that would include --

MS. TULIS: We didn't specifically address that issue.

MS. HODUSKI: Since I'm working with all the people at GPO on this problem, to me, this says that don't go back to press for things. This says you can fill anything with the microfiche. Is that what you really want?

I certainly plan on those 600 out-of-print things to work with GPO in helping to get those extra copies, particularly if they're coming from other agencies. To me, this says that all we have to do is send you a microfiche copy, and you may not want that if it's a journal issue or something like that.

MR. WALTER: I think this was aimed at claims. Also, Number Eight -- you might take a look at that while we're discussing Number Seven. While we're concerned here with claims that were sent in, we did not receive it -- it was distributed to everybody -- theoretically, a claim comes back and says "out-of-print". We would probably not be talking, in most cases, about very many items -- I would hope.

MS. HODUSKI: We don't want blowback or some other thing. Sometimes they do that, rather than send you microfiche. This sounds pretty rigid to me. If you could get just modify it a little, so that you just don't automatically get that all the time. Then, we get complaints from the depository library --

MS. CROSS: Bernadine, we're not picking up what you're saying.

MS. TULIS: Bernadine, this is a last-ditch effort when all else has failed.

MS. HODUSKI: Then, why don't you put that in there. I don't want somebody coming back to me with the resolution you passed that's saying: "Well, forget about those efforts that you're going under. This is all they want anyway."

MS. TULIS: But, when you say, you're going back for reprint.

MS. HODUSKI: Sometimes if they get enough requests that enough libraries got it out-of-print, this could justify their going back to press or producing it blowback or something like that, rather than just sending microfiche of one issue to libraries out there that may not want it that way. I think you should couch it a little more precise, so that you don't get something that you don't want.

MS. JACOB: Part of the problem is the timeliness of it. If we wait for negotiations -- I mean, many libraries need it right away. Is there any reason we couldn't ask for the microfiche, if it's available, immediately. Then, they could work on the paper. That's one of the problems.

MS. CROSS: The only thing is that would be difficult, too.

MS. EISENBEIS: I have some suggested wording. See if this sounds all right. "That the Library Program Service fill out-of-print claims with a microfiche copy if a microfiche master exists when all other options have failed."

MS. SMITH: That doesn't sound timely at all, though.

MS. EISENBEIS: It gives us an out, and, then, we can cover the timeliness with Eight.

MS. CROSS: Cover timeliness with what?

MS. EISENBEIS: Eight.

MS. TULIS: No, it doesn't because I don't get a raincheck for a House document when it's out-of-print. I get a out-of-print claim form back, and I know there's a microfiche master. I'd just as soon have that House report on microfiche, rather than nothing at all until the Serial Set arrives.

MS. EISENBEIS: Your saying you don't want to wait for these other options, you want to close the door on that. That's what you're saying.

MS. TULIS: No, I'm not because I have never seen them go back and fill an out-of-print claim for a House Report or a House Document.

MS. HODUSKI: They should be. They can go back and get those. If you continue to give the people who are supposed to be doing the procurement and supporting the Library Programs Service who are not controlled by LPS -- these go to the Public Printer -- and if you continue to give them outs for not doing what their job is which is to make sure that the Library gets enough copies for you, just giving them another way to say: "Well, it doesn't matter. If they don't get it, they'll just send them all out in microfiche, no matter what."

If you say it as the last possible thing or if you absolutely cannot get it. I'm concerned about those libraries not here who will continue to write and complain about getting mixed sets. We've heard about how difficult it is to get to those things. If it's an individual monograph, and they're holding a claim for a long time and they can convert it to microfiche and it's not part of a series or part of a periodical, that would be different. That might be an all-right solution.

MR. WALTER: Bernadine, while you're there, do you feel that Kathleen's suggested addition is not adequate?

MS. HODUSKI: I would think that it probably would be adequate. I don't know if the rest of the Council or the audience thinks it's adequate.

MR. VEATCH: It would appear to me what everybody would really like is that if something needs to be handled in this way, they could get the microfiche right away and want you all to still go back to try to get the paper, in which time you would send that to replace the microfiche they have, which as I understand it would not be legal. Isn't that right? That would not be legal? Is is possible to send another copy later on?

MS. HODUSKI: I've never agreed with past practices that if you get the fiche, you're not entitled to paper because I'm a person who believes in edition. There are editions. I consider a microfiche edition to be an entirely different product, than the paper edition; so, I've never held that position.

That's GPO's position, and that's a position to save money, naturally. But, that is not a publisher's decision. Nor should that be a librarian's position.

MR. VEATCH: Instead of what Kathleen suggested, how about ending that: ". . .until a paper copy" if that was what was requested "can be provided."

MS. SMITH: I sort of lost the thread of this conversation. I was under the impression that claims were when somebody didn't throw something in the appropriate box and you got something back that said -- you didn't get it. Your mail clerk tells you you didn't get it, and you claim the item. That's what you're trying to get at, is it not, Susan? That kind of claim.

I think we're confusing the issue of claims with the issue of rainchecks. I think because it doesn't have a rationale, perhaps, it's not clear. We're only dealing with those legitimate claims.

I think if we look at this, as Bob suggested, with Eight -- we're looking at both of the issues and we're dealing with them. One says you'll get the paper for the rainchecks and that you'll get the claims in microfiche if they exist. Right now you're not getting anything.

Right? Wouldn't you say?

A COUNCIL MEMBER: That's true.

A COUNCIL MEMBER: I understand where the confusion is.

MS. TULIS: Yes, because if there's only ten libraries that didn't get that House Document, they're not going to go back and reprint it. But, I think those ten would just as soon have a microfiche copy as not having anything at all.

MS. MILLS: Lois Mills, Western Ohio University. That's true so long as it is a House Document or a House Report.

Bernadine brought up the possibility of an issue of a journal being out of print, which has happened, and our getting a microfiche copy of it.

It seems to me we could get out of this bind with this particular one if we added what Kathleen said, and, then, in accordance with existing microfiching guidelines, which say that you don't, unless you absolutely have to, do one journal in microfiche -- that you don't put in microfiche the kinds of things from the Smithsonian that don't lend themselves to microfiching. I think that might take care of it.

It's a little more complicated than we're talking about it. I don't think that what Jim is suggesting will ever work administratively. I don't see how they could ever keep track of that. "We sent you a microfiche, but later on we're going to ask for it to be reprinted and send you a print copy." I just don't think that would ever work.

MS. CLARK: Marie Clark, Duke University. I would suggest that we take Seven and Eight and combine them in some way. What we're really concerned with -- at least, I'm concerned with -- is filling out-of-print claims the same way that some of these rainchecks are being filled. In many cases, I think it's probably more than ten libraries that are getting this out-of-print thing. It has to be from the number that my library's getting of out-of-print things.

If we could combine the out-of-print with the unfilled rainchecks in the language in Number Eight, recommending that the Public Printer take action to expedite the reprinting of short supply publications, so that 90% of rainchecks or out-of-print materials could be redeemed within ninety days of their issue date, and, then, something to the effect of barring that as a very last resort, making a microfiche master and supplying it in microfiche.

I think that we ought to put microfiche, as Bernadine suggested, at the bottom of the list, or else we're going to be getting some odd mixed media in our stacks. I'm just as concerned with these out-of-print things as I am with the rainchecks. I'm getting too many.

MR. WALTER: If I understand LPS's procedures correctly, there should never be a case where there are ten libraries. If they're that short or they're short ten, there should be rainchecks going in the box, not anything. What the problem seems to be are these cases where it's just not getting in the box out there.

Actually, the way I look at it these are two very distinct and different matters, and I certainly don't want to combine them together.

MS. JACOB: I think if that's true that you're only on one individual thing that we only have one of these and there may not be very many at all. Wouldn't it be possible when you're filling out your claim, just to say, "won't take microfiche" or "need microfiche". People who don't want it could just say they don't want it, but those of us who actually rely on getting it right away can say that for the things we need.

MS. TULIS: I'm lost. I still think it's two different problems because the rainchecks are something that happens before it goes in the box and the claim is something after it's gone to the libraries. I think if you try to combine it, it's just not going to work.

MS. CROSS: The LPS people, regarding claims -- the suggestion Roz made about on the claim form, if microfiche is available, would you want your claim in that. Is that workable?

MR. SCULLY: Could you repeat that point? I was consulting with my associates.

MS. CROSS: Roz made a suggestion that when making a claim, when timeliness is a factor, and being given the option of getting your claim in fiche rather than in hardcopy if it's available -- that might be one way. The libraries that are willing to take it can and those that aren't, get the out-of-prints. I don't know what then they do. Is that workable?

MR. SCULLY: I understand. The point your making is, as I take it, that we would be filling microfiche claims with microfiche and residual paper claims with microfiche.

MS. CROSS: If a microfiche master exists.

MR. SCULLY: The only problem that I see to that -- in concept it's fine -- would be a matter of the ability of our machine to handle that additional workload. To the extent that we would be able that might be feasible, but I don't know if the machine which was designed to handle microfiche. Of course, we have the ondemand project coming up, too -- that's an additional burden for that machine. Now, you have three workloads on that one machine and one operator.

I can't stand here and tell you that that could be handled. In concept, it sounds fine.

MS. TULIS: Mark, can I ask you a question?

MR. SCULLY: Uh-hum.

MS. CROSS: Susan.

MS. TULIS: Do you get any kind of record of how many things come back to us out-of-print? If there are only ten libraries getting House Document 97-3 out-of-print, do you know that? Do you if there are a hundred libraries getting an out-of-print claim on that? Do you know how many claims come?

MR. SCULLY: I'll have to ask Mr. Covington, our Depository Distribution Chief if we have a record or know how many out-of-prints are turned back.

MS. TULIS: We have no idea, then, the numbers that we're talking about?

MR. SCULLY: We could gather those data. I think it goes back -- of course, our policy is, in the case of paper documents, to order an additional twenty copies beyond the number needed for depository libraries to serve as claims.

Both Mr. Fossedal and I, on Wednesday, made mention of the fact that we suspect that certain libraries are either claiming copies that they had not selected or are claiming a second copy. We mentioned that some libraries are doing that.

As best we can tell, this might be where they're going. I'm not denying that certain errors are made on the throwing line, the distribution line, here in LPS. That does happen, but the consistency and the patterns that we see would indicate that libraries are submitting false claims, and that's eating up the twenty extra copies that are reserved for claiming.

MS. TULIS: Colleen doesn't keep any statistics of how many forms she sends back that she has stamped "out-of-print" on?

MR. SCULLY: No, Mr. Covington is indicating "no". We have the sheets. They could be counted. As of now, it would be an administrative burden that we don't see any purpose to for our immediate use, although it could be done. Again, it's another statistics-gathering exercise.

MS. HULYK: Barbara Hulyk, Detroit Public Library. Since one of my claims when I was still a selective happened to be the "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance" that came back out-of-print, I'm unhappy with that kind of position.

I wonder if there's a way to word this that the Library Programs Service be asked to examine methods to eliminate the out-of-print returns on properly submitted claims and that libraries be given that opportunity that Roz suggested to request a microfiche copy. There are some items we absolutely have to have.

In a way, you resent having to go and buy an item because there's inefficiency in the system. You could spend that money somewhere else on indexing the materials for the system or whatever else would be useful in the library.

MR. HAYES, Notre Dame: I don't think you want to confuse it. I think that Susan has an idea that this is solving a claiming problem. When twenty are gone, we get nothing. I see the points of we'd like what we ordered and to get it in the papercopy that's original. We don't have that option. As it is now, when it's out-of-print, you get zip. You can then go and buy a copy from Sales or soon you can buy a copy from on demand.

I think that this is a very specific recommendation that should be done. When the twenty-first library asks for that claim, they get it in microfiche. If they want to purchase a paper copy from sales, they have that option. That's the option that they have, now. Get nothing or buy it; but, at least, we will no longer be told, "We can't supply that to you out of our masters."

It's very upsetting for me to say, "We're not going to give you anything, but you buy or write the agency anything that you want for yourself." At least, they're fulfilling the requirements as they can for a claim.

That's their problem as to whether they ordered the right number and those libraries are trying to get extra copies. That's not my problem. I submitted a proper claim. I object to getting an "out-of-print" when a master can be produced in microfiche. If I want to go beyond that, that's my option; but, at least, a depository copy was sent out for those items that were available.

MR. MORTON: I'd like to call the question on the recommendation as originally read.

MS. CROSS: Do you wish to call the question on the original? There was the one little caveat, there, "when all other options have failed". You want to leave that out? Okay. Council, do you wish to call the question -- a parliamentarian vote on calling the question? Okay. This is a vote on calling the question on the original recommendation with no amendment on Recommendation Seven.

Carroll: Yes.
Eisenbeis: Yes.
Hordusky: Yes.
Jacob: Yes.
Mason: Yes.
Morton: Yes.

Prudden: I think I'll skip.

Raum: Yes.

Smith: Yes.

Tulis: Yes.

Veatch: Yes.

Walter: Yes.

Wilkins: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Calling the question as it is originally passes by 12 and 1 abstention.

Now, we will vote on the Recommendation.

Carroll: No.

Eisenbeis: Yes.

Hordusky: No.

Jacob: Yes.

Mason: Yes.

Morton: Yes.

Prudden: No.

Raum: Yes.

Smith: Yes.

Tulis: No. Wait a minute, what are we voting on?

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: We're voting on your --

(Laughter.)

Tulis: Yes.

(Laughter.)

Veatch: No.

Walter: Yes.

Wilkins: Yes.

MS. CROSS: The vote was 9 in favor and 4 against. The Recommendation passes.

All right. Let's move onto Eight. Susan, you get to do that one, too.

MS. TULIS: "Council is concerned with the overwhelming number of unfulfilled rainchecks, causing substantial administrative burden on libraries and delayed delivery of depository documents for public use. Council recommends that the Public Printer take action to expedite the reprinting of short-supply publications, so that ninety percent (90%) of rainchecks can be redeemed within ninety (90) days of their issue date. Council recommends that their fulfillment standard be implemented by the Spring, 1986 Council Meeting."

MR. MORTON: A friendly amendment in the next-to-the-last line that "their" be changed to "this".

MS. CROSS: Thank you. Any other comments or questions?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: I think we've pretty well discussed this, but does anyone from the audience wish to speak?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: All right. Council, are you ready to vote on Recommendation Eight -- rainchecks? All right.

Carroll:	Yes.
Eisenbeis:	Yes.
Hordusky:	Yes.
Jacob:	Yes.
Mason:	Yes.
Morton:	Yes.
Prudden:	Yes.
Raum:	Yes.
Smith:	Yes.
Tulis:	Yes.
Veatch:	Yes.
Walter:	Yes.
Wilkins:	Yes.

MS. CROSS: Unanimous vote, so Recommendation Eight passes. Jim, would you please take Recommendation Nine.

MR. VEATCH: "Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO begin an internship or personnel exchange program for Library Program Service staff, both junior and senior, and for depository library staff at GPO."

MR. MORTON: I would like to offer a friendly amendment in the next-to-the-last line, inserting after the second "and", "enabling them to work at depository libraries comma".

MS. CROSS: Wait a minute. When you say -- read the words right before that.

MR. VEATCH: I should insert before the "and", I'm sorry -- after "senior comma enabling them to work at depository libraries comma and for depository library staff to work" -- insert "to work" before "at GPO".

MS. CROSS: As I understand it, you say: "Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO begin an internship or personnel exchange program for Library Programs Service staff, both junior and senior, enabling them to work in depository libraries, and for depository library staff to work at GPO." Is that --

MR. VEATCH: That was my intention; so, that's perfectly acceptable and appreciated.

MS. CROSS: Anyone else? Council?

MS. SMITH: I have a question about do we really want them to do this, or do we really want them to look into it and report back to us about the feasibility. I know we had a discussion about this. It's one in the same, perhaps.

I would not like to put forth a recommendation like this, without knowing what it is they are going to have these people doing, what the implementation plan would be -- that kind of information. I have a hard time imagining Mark Scully opening boxes at my library or somebody from the line working on my reference desk. I want to know what they're going to be doing before we vote on something like this.

MS. CROSS: Okay. Marian.

MS. CARROLL: I think she stated my concern pretty well. The feasibility of it and the implementation are what concern me. In theory, it's great; but the specifics concern me.

MS. CROSS: Jim, would you like to propose, maybe, a different wording.

MR. VEATCH: Do you think that there is a possibility that something might be worse than nothing? Is that your concern? That it could be so badly handled that it would not be useful?

MS. CARROLL: Not necessarily that, but if sending someone who knows their job here out to my library as an exchange person is going to hamper the delivery of the products I want in a timely manner, I'm concerned.

MR. VEATCH: I would think there would be a joint arrangement. I don't think they're going to just send somebody out and abduct somebody off your staff. I don't really understand the concern. It seems to be a great one, but I don't understand it.

MS. CARROLL: Maybe, it isn't a problem; maybe, it's in my mind.

MS. EISENBEIS: It seems to me it would be voluntary, and if that would be your feeling, I would think that you wouldn't want to participate, but I think there are some people who might think it's a good idea and could be given the option. It seems to me that because of your concern, you wouldn't participate. You wouldn't be forced to take --

MS. CARROLL: I like the idea of it very much. Anytime one gets new personnel, there is a training period. Depending upon the length of the training period, you have somewhat limited production. Can that be afforded at both ends? If people are willing to do it, fine; but I think that's a consideration.

MR. HORDUSKY: I also question the legality of whether GPO can pay a non-government employee for their time or whether it would be voluntary. I know I could not at a state library pay a federal government employee for their time, and I also question the extensive amount of training that both people would have to have on each end.

The other question is: Can GPO really afford to lose their staff on extended periods of time?

MS. CROSS: Okay, Don?

MR. FOSSEDAL: We are fortunate to have one of our fine attorneys here, today, Jim Lane. He would like to comment on this resolution, and if you will indulge us, we would like to backtrack, also, at the end of that, to Resolution Three. He would like to make a comment on that. So, I'll leave it up to Jim. Thank you.

MR. LANE: Thank you, Don. I'm sorry I came in just a little bit too late to comment on Resolution Number Three.

If I could ask -- I suppose -- the purpose of this particular resolution?

MS. CROSS: Are you talking about Three, now?

MR. LANE: Yes, I'm sorry. If the purpose --

MS. CROSS: Could you wait just a moment?

MR. LANE: Yes.

MS. PETERSON: If he is going to address both, couldn't we stay on the discussion that we're presently under and, then, go back to that.

MS. CROSS: Yes, that's what I was wondering. Could we finish the discussion on this one, and, then, we will come back and make the remarks.

MR. LANE: On Resolution Number Nine, I don't see any problem in the Council making this recommendation, I suppose; but I think that Mr. Hordusky's comment is very well taken that this will require, so far as I can see, some statutory approval I don't think the Public Printer can actually accomplish as the resolution seems to infer. While this certainly may very well be a good recommendation from the Council, I think you should understand that it probably will require statutory considerations.

MR. VEATCH: I may have been in error, here, because I somehow had gotten the idea that internships in government were not that unusual a thing -- that they did exist and have existed. I seemed to have heard about interns at the Library of Congress. To me, that's a different sort of thing than what we're suggesting here.

MR. LANE: There are provisions for the internships in a number of agencies, but, unfortunately, we don't have that for this particular program. It does require, so far as I know, specific statutory coverage.

MS. CROSS: Jim, may I offer a friendly amendment? "Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO include in its Education Task Force deliberations consideration of an internship or personnel exchange program for Library Programs Service staff, both junior and senior, enabling them to work in depository libraries and for depository library staff to work at GPO." Or, just put a period at "internship or personnel exchange programs".

MR. VEATCH: I think I prefer your original -- what you said before you said the "or".

MS. CROSS: That leaves it up to GPO -- they can consider it in their deliberations, and they may find this is what you were saying about the statutory requirement, etc. The intent that we'd like for them to consider it is there.

MR. VEATCH: It appears to me that it would be a useful thing to do if it is, indeed, possible and not terribly inconvenient and legal. I want to accept what you've proposed, rather than just throw the whole thing out.

MS. CROSS: All right. Council, what I have proposed is: "Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO include in its Education Task Force deliberations, consideration of an internship or personnel exchange program for Library Programs Service staff, both junior and senior, enabling them to work in depository libraries and for depository library staff to work at GPO."

Is that acceptable?

MS. TULIS: Would you read it one more time?

MS. CROSS: The changes: The first line as it is; the second line, take out the word "begin" and insert "include in its Education Task Force deliberations consideration of" and, then, finish the rest of that line; then, the insert what Bruce had suggested earlier, after the word "senior" on the third line, insert "enabling them to work in depository libraries"; then, following "and for depository library staff", insert "to work" "at GPO".

Are we ready to vote? Are there any other comments, Council? Mr. Fossedal? Any others?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: On Recommendation Nine, we're ready to vote.

Carroll: Yes.

Eisenbeis: Yes.
Hordusky: Yes.
Jacob: Yes.
Mason: Yes.
Morton: No.
Prudden: Yes.
Raum: Yes.
Smith: Yes.
Tulis: Yes.
Veatch: Yes.
Walter: Yes.
Wilkins: Yes.

MS. CROSS: The vote is 12 in favor and 1 against; the Recommendation passes.

MR. WALTER: I was going to move that Council reconsider Item Number Three.

MS. CROSS: Thank you for reminding me.

MR. LANE: Thank you very much. Again, I'm sorry I got in too late to comment on this before. I suppose I should ask, again, what is the purpose of this particular resolution, and if the purpose is to provide some input into the solicitation, it's too late for that.

MS. EISENBEIS: The purpose was not to have input. The purpose was to have the information as a point of reference. We are constantly being asked about this issue, and it seems to me since we asked for it yesterday or the day before and were told we couldn't have it ahead of time, even to examine it, we want to have a reference document that gives us the information, and it seemed to us that this was the logical piece to ask for. We may be asking for the wrong thing. What we want is the information.

MR. MORTON: Much of the impetus to engage somebody to do this project has come from this Council over the years and it's something that, I think, we just want to keep ourselves apprised.

MR. LANE: I can certainly understand that, but there are some contractual considerations that have to be made at this point. Of course, the discussion regarding the confidentiality of the proposal was certainly well taken. After its release to the general public, of course, there's no reason why you or anyone else couldn't look at it, but I raise the question because I would assume that you may want to provide some input to that solicitation.

MS. EISENBEIS: I think we're asking for what we put on the page. I think you're assuming something that we are not asking for.

MR. LANE: Okay, I'll proceed to the second point, then, and that is you've requested that you be advised of the developments with regard to the contract. Again, if you are asking for a status of the contract negotiations, that sort of thing, the contracting officer is not able to discuss that with anyone. He can't even tell you the number of offers that he has or the number of proposals that he has.

If you think that you're going to get a detailed status of the negotiations -- or I'm not sure what you think that you're going to be getting at that point.

MS. EISENBEIS: I think it's an open statement, so that whatever you can legally tell us upon our request for information, you will provide. It's to make the point that we are interested, and when the request comes, you won't be surprised.

MR. LANE: Well, that's all well and good. I think the contracting officer will have to inform you or anyone asking that he can't release this kind of information. Again, it's unclear to me as to what is really behind this, but if there is something behind it; I mean, obviously, there must be some reason that it's there -- that reason I don't quite understand.

MS. EISENBEIS: Would you like me to say it, again?

MR. LANE: I understand what you said.

MS. EISENBEIS: Can you repeat what I've said to you, so that I can see if you know what I've said.

MR. LANE: As I understand it, and I can understand that you have provided the impetus, perhaps, for some of this -- I'm not sure to what extent -- but, since you have, you want to be kept advised of the status of it.

MS. EISENBEIS: Not advised. I think you're confusing our need for input and advice when I don't think that's our intention. I think you're coming with a mentality that we don't want to have you go away with. I don't think we want anything more than what's on this page. If you can't tell us because of a legal requirement, then, I think we would understand.

MS. CROSS: Just a moment. Could Bruce make a statement?

MR. MORTON: I think there is no hidden agenda on this at all. I think, basically, what we're asking the Public Printer to do is to keep us apprised as he is able to on the issue -- nothing more. We're not asking for specific information at any given point along the way. Whatever is within the bounds of ethics and good judgment within the organization, we are merely expressing our continuing interest in this and asking that you put forward the information as you are able.

MS. CROSS: I think -- if I may also speak -- that we would simply like to know when the contract is awarded and to whom it was awarded. I don't think we want to see a copy of the contract. That's obviously not what we're wanting. We do not want to get that deeply involved. We simply want to be apprised when the contract has been awarded if, indeed, one is and to whom and, then, if there's a completion date on it and so forth -- just some nitty-gritty is basically it.

There's a gentleman here, or did you need to reply.

MR. LANE: If that is, in fact, the purpose of it, then, I would suggest that this be amended to reflect that. There's certainly nothing wrong with contracting officer or, I'm sure, with the Public Printer advising you when a contract is let and to whom it's let. But, that's a different or, at least, I get a different concept from this.

MR. VEATCH: We are not asking for anything from the contract officer. He is not mentioned in here. We're not asking for anything except we've asked the Public Printer for this tape update and we want to know what's going along with it to the extent that he can -- he's doing this for us.

We're just saying we're still interested, and we want to know what's going on to the best that you can tell us.

MR. LANE: Unfortunately, you've used some "catch words" that are unique to contracting. If that is your purpose, then, there is no need to use these "catch words" that pertain to contracting.

MR. VEATCH: Which are the offending words?

MR. LANE: Like "request for proposal" -- that has a definite contractual meaning.

MR. VEATCH: The RFP is open to anybody to look at, isn't it?

MR. LANE: Yes, but after --

MR. VEATCH: We're just saying that we would like a copy of the RFP to see if -- just to look at it.

MR. LANE: That's really the point I'm getting at, I suppose. If you want it, at that point, to sharpshoot it -- to put it very bluntly --

MR. VEATCH: That's not in here, and that's not part of the language; that's my point.

MR. LANE: It's too late for that at that point. If you want input --

MR. VEATCH: We don't ask for that --

MR. LANE: -- to the RFP --

MR. VEATCH: We don't ask for the input.

MR. LANE: I gather that you have heretofore attempted to get input into this. Maybe, that's good; I'm not saying that's bad.

MS. EISENBEIS: I think you're being overly sensitive. I really --

MS. CROSS: Would you yield a minute, and let Peyton Neal make a statement?

MR. NEAL: I think that we're at an impasse because typical government contracting, and probably in the GPO exclusively, may be a two-step process. Sources sought which the solicitation published already in "CBD" is what I understand to be and request for proposal which is the formal process that procurement law does not allow a great deal of latitude in any part of the federal government in contracting.

Recently, the Securities and Exchange Commission put in a third, and an interim step, which, I think, would greatly aid this whole process and would give Council what, I believe, it wants; and that is, not the formal RFP after the source is sought, but a preliminary document that does not probably have formal status in most government procurement law, now, where people are allowed to comment from both sides before the request for the proposal is issued.

For the electronic filing system "Edgar", this has proved to be a very satisfying factor for the legislative branch, as well as the executive branch, because it gives all parties an interim step to read what ultimately may appear as a RFP and raise their hand and say: "Hey, you're asking for something that we don't need or you're asking for something that we've already gotten or the way that your asking is not the way the contractor is going to understand it."

I would merely suggest that the Council, through some part of the Library Programs Service, empower LPS to deal with the contracting people here, so that Council gets an opportunity, if it's feasible, to have that interim, middle step between the sources sought solicitation and the formal contracting procedure, where it, indeed, would be appropriate for libraries, reading specifications who have done work in this area, as well as contractors from the information industry community that are already doing this, to ask questions in an informal setting, rather than in the formal process which is now called the bidders' meeting, which many RFP's don't even require or engender.

Is that acceptable, or have I made it more confusing?

MR. VEATCH: I don't think it totally is. We don't want to ask questions when we see the RFP. I don't think -- I think most of us don't. I think a lot of us want to answer questions. A lot of the depository library community has been involved in this issue for long time.

The Request For Proposal has gone out, and people are going to be saying, "What's in this thing that you've worked so hard for? Well, we don't know: we just know that a Request For Proposal has been made. We've got no idea what's really in it."

I don't see what the problem is in our seeing the RFP. There seems to be one.

MR. NEAL: I don't think there's any problem in your going into the government procurement process the way any of us in the private sector do after it's issued. What I thought I heard Council saying is that if there is opportunity for some input when a formal document is issued, before that formal document goes on the table, we would like to have it

I take this from discussions that I've had over the past two years with Judy Myers and other systems people in the industry.

MR. WALTER: Mr. Neal, we did not say that. The Counsel said that. Madam Chairman, I would like to withdraw my motion to reconsider and suggest that we move on.

MS. CROSS: Yes. My suggestion is that rather than try to amend this and spend a lot of time rewriting, that GPO will respond to this in the way that they are allowed to respond to it. If we have asked for something that is not possible to have because of the legal requirements and all of this, I think you can simply tell us that.

We would like to know to whom the contract is awarded, what information we may be allowed to know about what is in the Request For Proposal, but I agree with Bob that we're just going around in circles and we're not really accomplishing anything.

I don't believe that leaving the recommendation as it is means GPO cannot return an answer. I'm sure they will be asking legal counsel for advice.

MR. LANE: If I could just clarify one point. There's not problem that I know of about your getting a copy of the

Request For Proposal, as was indicated over here.

MS. CROSS: I do not think that you're going to get our people coming back and saying, "Change it." That is not the intent.

MR. LANE: I just wanted to reemphasize that point. But, there is a problem about the precise status of the negotiations.

MS. CROSS: Yes. I think that's clearly understood. We will move on.

Unfortunately, Bruce had to leave to catch a plane. I thought we were making such fabulous time, here. Diane, would you like to --

MS. SMITH: Number Ten is, "The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that LPS contact Council for input prior to making major policy changes affecting depository library operations and that a full explanation of the theoretical basis or economic necessities of such policy changes be provided in Administrative Notes."

Before he left, Bruce amended his recommendation.

MS. CROSS: Okay. Would you?

MS. SMITH: Yes. Where it says, "affecting depository library operations" on the third line "comma and upon implementation of such policy changes" -- cross out the "that" -- "a full explanation be provided in Administrative Notes" -- which means you just cross out the next line and the word changes.

The full text would then read: "The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that LPS contact Council for input prior to making major policy changes affecting depository library operations, and upon implementation of such policy changes a full explanation be provided in Administrative Notes."

MS. CROSS: All right. Council, do you need that read again?

MR. VEATCH: It's not that, but I'm puzzled, here. This seems to be very much like what I recommended.

MS. CROSS: Is it? Maybe, several of us.

MR. VEATCH: You did say this was from Bruce, is that right?

MS. CROSS: Well, maybe, it was from you. I don't know.

MR. VEATCH: At any rate, I'm in favor of it.

(Laughter.)

MS. SMITH: I think what happened, Jim, is that we combined. You had one and Bruce had one, and they were combined into one.

MS. CROSS: I think it was Jim, and I'm sorry.

Do you accept the friendly amendments?

MR. VEATCH: Yes, and I was asked to bring these sorts of recommendations from people back home. That's why I wanted to make sure that they knew that --

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: We'll say Bruce and Jim or just Jim. I'm sure Bruce doesn't care.

MR. VEATCH: I don't mind sharing it with Bruce, either.

MS. CROSS: Council, any further comment? Audience? Yes, please identify yourself.

MR. McGEACHY: I'm Jack McGeachy from NC State. I think this recommendation is a very good one. I'd like, before the meeting closes, though, for us to repeat or return to the discussion on the issue that brought this to the floor; and that is the great number of classification changes that are forthcoming into the system from GPO.

I wrote hastily amongst a number of suggestions that were offered to LPS for their resolution and did not see anything that directed itself to the issue of classification changes. I don't know what to take home. Do I go home and say to the folks: "Here's a little rawhide; grit your teeth; we're going to continue to get innumerable classification changes."

Is that going to be something that the committee looking at expanded List of Classes is going to look at? Are we going to see any diminution of these changes, or are we going to continue to get many, many, many of them? Is this going to become entrenched as the Senate numbering scheme did without adequate discussion?

MS. CROSS: I think, also, in this -- one of the suggestions to even put in the recommendation and we left it out was if the Council is contacted and we feel that, such as the classification change that you're referring to, would have such impact that we would probably suggest that the depository library community be surveyed or contacted in some manner before the change goes into effect because the Council would have some feel for that and say that this is something that will really affect our operation -- and that's behind all of this. We didn't specifically say it, but we are sensitive to that concern.

You were asking if the classification change was going to stay. I'm assuming it is. We are not --

MS. SMITH: I understand very much your concerns and the concerns of everyone else. Perhaps, what Council should suggest is that we appoint another committee to look at the classification issue.

Unfortunately, this has been brought up -- not unfortunately -- it's been brought up at many places, the classification problem, and when you really push people to the wall, there will be a vocal 50% who hate, but there are a lot of people in the audience who also like the class numbers evolving this way.

I don't think we can turn around and say we don't like it. I don't think the reason that LPS went to this change was correct. If Illinois GODORT or GODORT or anyone had asked them to do it, that was not right that they should have done it without asking Council, which is what we're trying to get at here.

I understand the concern for classification. I think we need to investigate it further. Perhaps, that's what we should look at -- if that would be acceptable to Council.

MS. CROSS: Yes, Council, any volunteers?

MS. SMITH: I'll look at it.

MS. CROSS: We'll put Diane in charge of that and ask her to come back with a report. You may certainly ask for --

we'll work on getting it.

MS. SMITH: I'll be calling people about it at LPS.

MS. CROSS: Any other comments? Council? Audience?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Are you ready to vote on Recommendation Ten?

Carroll:	Yes.
Eisenbeis:	Yes.
Hordusky:	Yes.
Jacob:	Yes.
Mason:	Yes.
Prudden:	Yes.
Raum:	Yes.
Smith:	Yes.
Tulis:	Yes.
Veatch:	Yes.
Walter:	Yes.
Wilkins:	Yes.

MS. CROSS: Passed unanimously. Let's move on to Recommendation Eleven. Diane, I have your name by that one.

MS. SMITH: "The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office produce the 1981-1985 quinquennial index to the Monthly catalog only in microfiche and with adequate headers."

MR. VEATCH: This is one that I have a special problem with. This index would be, I assume, a sales item that could be purchased by anyone. There seems to be no rationale that I can see for the Council to decide that nobody ought to have the option to buy that index in paper.

I know I would buy it in paper. I can't imagine that I'm the only person in the country who would. If sales is willing to pick it up this way and market it, and we've not heard anything that says they aren't, I don't really understand why Council wants to deprive potential customers of this product in paper.

MS. EISENBEIS: If you'll remember correctly, the rationale as it's written, Jim, was the reason because we thought that the economics of doing it in paper would take away from their resources and they could move on.

MR. VEATCH: But, what makes us think that? Have we done a survey on this? I know I don't want it in microfiche if I can buy it in paper. That's just the way I use it at my library. If there is anybody else who would use the quinquennial that way or knows of anybody in your area who might, I would certainly like to hear about that.

Certainly, I will not vote against this proposal if I don't hear that there's anybody else who's happy with it the way it's written.

MS. CARROLL: Jim, I think a lot of us like to have paper indexes. Part of the reason for this, as I recall our discussion, was that if it's delivered in microfiche, it's computer output and would be out very promptly, so we'd have access to it. There would be a delay for a paper copy, as well as the fact that the paper would take a whole shelf.

If we could get the microfiche copy immediately and they want later to make paper, I've no objection.

MR. VEATCH: It seems to me that how much I'd be willing to pay for this and how much shelf I've got to devote to it is pretty much my decision -- not the Depository Library Council's.

MS. CARROLL: You're right. I agree with you.

MR. VEATCH: That's not what the resolution --

MS. CARROLL: I know it.

MS. CROSS: Any other Council wish to speak?

MS. CLARK: Maria Clark, Duke University. Jim, I agree with you totally, and I'm wondering how many people who are here today have purchased the last quinquennial index from private publisher at the tune of $480 to have it in paper. That's what I'm into. I would hope that the Government Printing Office could provide it to us if it was made a sales item for less than $480.

I agree. I don't think that this is a particular issue for Council to decide. It's up to the rest of us. How many have purchased the privately published one for $480?

(A show of hands.)

A few. So, there are some people who would like the option. My feeling is and, maybe, some other people would feel the same way is that we'd rather have the option of dealing with the Government Printing Office in publishing it rather than it going to a private publisher.

MS. CROSS: I would like to remind you that this is a recommendation. If GPO wants to make the decision that they sell it -- offer it in paper -- they may certainly do that. We are making a strong recommendation. We are asked to advise GPO, and I guess if GPO later feels differently, GPO can -- we're not the dictators as to what GPO does and does not do. We're only recommending; we're only advisory.

MS. AXTMAN: Margie Axtmann, Cornell Law Library. At my library, we've decided that the fiche index is appropriate and adequate for our needs, but in the discussion a couple of days ago, a number of people got up and expressed a great need for a paper copy of the quinquennial index.

I don't know if they're not here today or if they're just not speaking, but I think that Council needs to remember that and not make a recommendation that would affect the entire depository library community who would only be able to get the index in fiche if the recommendation is followed.

Where a lot of libraries really need this item in paper or need to have the option of choosing either fiche or paper formats. Mark Scully indicated that the index could be produced in an and/or fashion -- microfiche and paper or microfiche or paper. I think we ought to take this into consideration.

MS. CROSS: I don't know who was next. Was it you, Barbara, or Steve?

MS. HULYK: Barbara Hulyk, Detroit Public Library. I think I'd like the option, also, since we've just been surveyed for the option in the other forms of the Monthly catalog. I think that libraries should have an option on the five-year index. I think if there's a factor of time and speed to get it out, then, I think we would accept a microfiche product first, with a paper to come later. But, I think we should have the ability to get that paper product, if we choose, from GPO.

MR. HAYES, Notre Dame: I'd have to agree with the same thing. Your recommendation is pretty specific, only in microfiche. If you had said: "At a minimum, the microfiche with adequate headers would be produced", I think you're letting yourself out, but this is pretty strong indication to GPO.

I agree with Jim. First of all, I'd get the depository copy in paper, and I'll buy the microfiche. I think we don't want to decide for a large market out there.

Also, why did you limit it to five years? I mean that previous five accumulation with no headers -- if it's COM-fiche, why not get it all done at once? Again, you should have, at least, add that as an option and make this at a minimum -- not the only way to do it.

MR. WALTER: Steve, we asked about that other thing. There's a real technical problem within GPO and how they handle that first thing and not having access to the tapes, we asked that specifically and were told that it is so difficult that the cost and time involved would be very difficult.

So, I agree with you. I would have loved to see that, too. Hopefully, in the future, maybe this can go to a five, a six, a seven or whatever; but, unfortunately, the way it is now, that's into the tape update classification right now.

MS. CROSS: Any other comments, Council?

MS. YUKAWA: Masako Yukawa, CW Post Center, Long Island University. I strongly urge the Depository Council members not to endorse this microfiche only. Our experiences of dealing with the previous quinquennial -- we didn't use it at all. To begin with, we had to write out the headers and paste it. Still, it was too cumbersome. Suppose this quinquennial issue is published in paper in the voluminous bulk, we can always discard all the annual indexes which you've been binding and will save quite a bit of shelf space if this index is designed that way.

MS. HODUSKI: I would just like to remind everybody that the sales copy that would be produced is totally self-sustaining. I mean they crank all the costs into it. If you're worried about the sales customers, I think they can make their own decisions or there should be a market test to see how many of those people want it.

I think that if you're suggesting this for the Depository Library Program, I don't think that you represent the sales community. One of you, actually, is not a depository library on the Council, and we have other customers to serve; so, I think before the Joint Committee on Printing would go along with this, we would want to know what the sales customers want.

MS. HULYK: Barbara Hulyk, Detroit Public Library. I think we should be reminded that there is already a paper index being prepared. The pre-publication notices have gone out; so, that there obviously is a market for a papercopy of the index.

MS. CROSS: Council, are you ready to vote?

All right, on Recommendation Eleven.

Carroll: No.
Eisenbeis: No.
Hordusky: Yes.
Jacob: No.
Mason: No.
Prudden: No.
Raum: No.
Smith: Yes.
Tulis: No.
Veatch: No.
Walter: No.
Wilkins: No.

MR. VEATCH: If I might make a brief comment here in terms of the comment about the headers. We have been informed that there will be good headers this time, that they've learned a whole lot -- so, what we did not defeat with the part that there would be adequate headers on the microfiche. I think we've been assured that there will be.

MS. CROSS: The vote, in case you were not keeping track, 10 opposed and 2 in favor. The Recommendation fails.

Here we are at Number Twelve, and it's almost twelve. Bob.

MR. WALTER: "The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that at one of the regular meetings of GPO bookstore managers, a formal presentation on the Depository Library Program be given, and the bookstore employees be encouraged to arrange a tour of a depository library in their area."

Also, the rationale was left off of this, as indicated, and I believe it's been passed out -- if not, I'm sure there are copies available somewhere. I would also like to add to my discussion with the Superintendent of Documents that the bookstore managers have been given a presentation, apparently through the marketing area, and, perhaps, maybe, a more thorough presentation the LPS or something along that line might be in order.

MS. SMITH: This is a friendly amendment for Bruce to break the next-to-the-last line: "Bookstore employees be encouraged to tour a depository library in their area."

MR. WALTER: That's the way I had it first, and they changed it on me last night.

MS. CROSS: Midnight madness, they call it or something like that. Sorry.

MR. WALTER: That's fine with me. It's just the way I had it in the first place.

MS. CROSS: Was there any other change?

MR. WALTER: No.

MS. CROSS: Any other comments from Council?

MS. O'BRIEN: Mary Lee O'Brien, GPO. Charles McKeown, the Director of Marketing, just wanted me to make a few comments on this. First, we do appreciate the fact that the recommendation was even written because we are going to be meeting with the bookstore managers next week, and we're delighted to be able to tell them that Council is so interested in them and see them as an important part of the information dissemination process.

Second, we in the Marketing Department do always make a particular point in any of our presentations to make the Depository Library Program part of that presentation. That's my job. We certainly will be happy to expand upon that, and I do try to impress upon the bookstore managers that if they want to know the names and addresses of their local depository librarians, if they do not already know, I'll be happy to be a conduit for them and make the connection.

MS. CROSS: Thank you.

MR. WALTER: I'd just like to get on the record with the fact that in my particular area there is a government bookstore at Kansas City. The manager of that bookstore is extremely enthusiastic and extremely helpful with helping depository libraries; however, just in my general conversations with the manager and despite her enthusiasm which I'm sure, unfortunately, is not shared by all bookstore managers -- there are some misunderstandings of our role, our function, what we're all about.

I really think it will help both of us, in the long run, both programs -- the depository library program and the bookstore program -- to work closely together, to increase the access to government information.

MR. THURSTON: Paul Thurston, Broward County Library. Both in my experience in Detroit and in Florida -- in Detroit, we had an excellent bookstore, and we have very good working relationships, and I constantly invited the manager or any of her staff to come up, and she said, "Oh, we'll have to do that; we'll have to do that." The same thing in Jacksonville -- Vickie Batzka's just fantastic, and I don't know if she's been over to see Bruce Latimer at UNF or the Jacksonville Public Library, but I think it would be very helpful to them to have GPO instigate this because, I think, they feel guilty about leaving their workposts and taking the time to do this -- not that they don't want to, but if it were made known that they should do this, then, they would feel a little more at ease about leaving their bookstores and going out and doing it. I think they would love to do it, but they just feel that, maybe, this is like goofing off or something.

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: Are you ready to vote, Council, on Recommendation Twelve? All right.

Carroll: Yes.

Eisenbeis: Yes.

Hordusky: Yes.

Jacob: Yes.
Mason: Yes.
Prudden: Yes.
Raum: Yes.
Smith: Yes.
Tulis: Yes.
Veatch: Yes.
Walter: Yes.
Wilkins: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Passed unanimously. That is the end of our recommendations.

The other thing that is on the agenda is to -- I'm sorry. Diane, would you come up here. Do you want to sit there?

MS. SMITH: Yes, it's easier.

When we amended the By-Laws, the question was asked as to the distribution of the various pieces of information that give information about meetings of the Depository Library Council and are they available. GPO has found this information.

The transcripts of the meetings have been distributed to all libraries in microfiche from 1975 on. The summary of meetings have been distributed to depository libraries from April of 1981 through April of 1983. Correction. The April and the September of '81 were distributed; the April of '83 was distributed.

The Report to the Public Printer -- four reports have been issued, 1972 through '76, 1976 through '77, 1977 through '78 and 1978 through 1979.

The Guidelines for the Depository Library System, the By-Laws, are free from the Government Printing Office from the Superintendent of Documents for write-in.

In my discussion with Mark, he seemed to feel that the transcripts could be possible as a sales item. Correct? Because they're on microfiche from '75 on.

MR. SCULLY: That would be a decision for the Sales Service to make. I couldn't speak to that.

MR. HORDUSKY: That still does not absolve the previous people from writing their annual report because this is not retroactive and cannot be retroactive -- from you, Jennie, on, they do not have to do it.

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: I was told that previous chairs are working on them. Perhaps, we should in the Spring amend it again.

On the agenda, we were talking about the location for the Spring meeting, and Council usually many times comes with invitations to go to a particular locality. If those of you who are attending your first meeting, traditionally the Fall meeting is held in Washington, as this one is being held, and the Spring meeting is held elsewhere in the country.

This time, some thought is being given to probably going to somewhere in the Midwest. Is there any recommendation from Council?

I think that this is something, obviously, that the Public Printer will decide, and this will be announced, I'm sure, as soon as that decision is made.

I will use my usual caveat about I would love to have you all come to Detroit, but Detroit in March is not my favorite place in the world. I would like to leave Detroit in March. I would be happy to see any of you any other time of the year -- or even in March, too, as far as that matter goes.

I think there is one person who didn't get any thanks -- well, he did get thanks publicly, but he wasn't here -- and that's Dave Brown, and he's back in the back. We want to thank you, Dave, for all of your help and your assistance in providing things almost instantaneously when we needed them and running so many errands for us and helping make us comfortable at this meeting. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. CROSS: I also want to thank the Council because, as I said earlier, without this talented group of people, my job would be a lot harder, and you've made it very easy for me this time, and I thank you all. Especially -- thank you, Diane, for chairing the open forum on Wednesday. You did an excellent job.

MR. FOSSEDAL: Just a few closing remarks. I want to thank everyone for coming. I think it was a fantastic Council meeting, except for a couple pejorative comments here and there, I think the new spirit of a lowered level of stridency and quality meetings with productive input and valid criticisms and very open responses on the part of GPO, I think it should be the kind of Council meetings that we should have and encourage.

I do want to give some special thanks because there are some people here who did a great deal of work to make this such a success. I'm not going to necessarily take them in order of importance or anything else -- so, if you're last or forgotten, don't feel that you are less important or conversely more important if you happen to be one of the early ones.

First, I want to make very sure that everyone here gives Dave Brown from the marketing staff a tremendous hand. I'll tell you why. This was the first meeting in this new format in this building. There was a myriad of considerations -- a little thing like getting you badges so you could go in and out of this building and to the cafeteria doesn't seem like much; but we have bomb scares in this building; we have a tremendous potential for security problems; we do print the passports. For Dave Brown to be able to get things like this done was a tremendous effort.

I was more than pleased at the outstanding job he did. It was his idea. I'd like to claim it, but it was his idea to tape the workshop on Tuesday, which we, through some editing and improving, I think we might be able to provide you for workshops and seminars in your area, but I do want everyone here to know that Dave Brown is in a great part responsible for the success of this meeting, and I'd like everyone to give him a round of applause.

(Applause.)

Is Mike Bright here, by any chance? If Mike were here, he's my program analyst and is working on the Depository Study

Group. Mike will be one of the members on there. As you know, I call him "Bright-squared", and he is an outstanding writer and will keep this program going.

I think particular praise should go to Council in general and very specifically to Jennie for the meeting in general and for that panel yesterday. I'd like to have these very high quality panels as often as we can. This was Jennie's idea. She held my feet to the fire on it. Everytime somebody would cancel, she'd be back on the phone until we had a proper replacement and a bio on the person who was the replacement. I want to thank her and I want to thank the members of Council. I am very proud of my Library Programs Service staff. I've kept track. I've had fourteen separate occasions in the last three days where people have come up to me and said, "You know, your staff really does do a good job." I commend them for it, and I appreciate it.

I want to thank Marketing for following in a great tradition and putting on a great presentation.

I also want to thank the Public Printer and the Deputy Public Printer for taking the time to come down here out of their busy schedules and help us out.

I'm also very pleased that Bruce Morton was assigned to help us on the development of the Biennial Survey. I'm going to use his talents, perhaps, as a test program to use various members of Council in the future when we have very specific areas of concern or areas in which we want to improve.

Thank you all for coming. I hope you enjoyed yourself. I hope you learned something. I'm glad you taught us something. Again, any librarian that calls me, I generally answer them within the hour.

If you call me or you stop by, part of my success as Superintendent of Documents will be that I'm very open. I'll be at ALA. Both times, I've been appointed the representative to GODORT. I'll be probably to SLA and AALL -- I'm getting good with these acronyms.

Thank you, again, and have a safe trip home.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Last and least, as usual. The best we can figure -- there were more than 200 people who visited during the days that we were here. I think some people signed in several times, but, basically, other than members of GPO and members of Council, more than 200 people attended. We're very grateful for all of you observing all the idiotic regulations we have in getting in and out of the building.

MS. CROSS: I don't think I appropriately thanked the LPS staff for your time. Many people came early and stayed late to help us, and I'm very grateful. Your patience is outstanding -- it really is. We do appreciate your contribution. Without you, we can't do this.

Council, if there's no further --

MS. EISENBEIS: Jennie, are you going to reannounce the tour and where we're supposed to meet?

MS. CROSS: Yes, I certainly will. Thank you for reminding me. The tour this afternoon at the Library of Congress, in order to see the Optical Disk System you go to the Madison Building, the Library of Congress Madison Building at 1:30. Melissa Betcher is the tour guide, and she should be down there in the front to meet you and greet you and take you to the area where the Optical Disk System is.

As I mentioned, yesterday, there is a checkroom across from the gift shop where you may leave your luggage if, indeed, that is necessary.

MS. EISENBEIS: There are two entrances to that building. Did she say which --

MS. CROSS: It is my understanding it is the main entrance. It's the one where there is a gift shop. Not going there that often, am I correct, you native people? Is that right? That's the main entrance. Independence Avenue. All right. Main entrance to the Madison Building. I hope that all of you who did sign up can go. They're expecting approximately 50 of us there at 1:30.

If there's no further announcements, I adjourn the Fall, 1985 Meeting of the Depository Library Council.

Thank you all.

(Adjourn at 12:10 p.m.)